A HISTORY of the FRIENDS in AMERICA

ALLEN C. THOMAS
RICHARD H. THOMAS

Elizabeth A. Henry.

A HISTORY OF THE FRIENDS IN AMERICA

BY
ALLEN C. THOMAS, A.M.
AND
RICHARD HENRY THOMAS, M.D.

FOURTH EDITION
THOROUGHLY REVISED AND ENLARGED
BY
ALLEN C. THOMAS, A.M.

PHILADELPHIA
THE JOHN C. WINSTON CO.
1905.

Copyright 1894
By The Christian Literature Company.

Revised Edition,
Copyright 1905
By The John C. Winston Company.

PREFACE TO FOURTH EDITION.

THE fact that the present edition has been printed from new type has afforded the opportunity to make many changes in the text, almost all of which, however, have been in the line of greater clearness and precision. All errors of whatever kind, have, so far as known, been corrected, and a number of unintentional omissions have been remedied. The narrative has been brought up to date, and in every respect great pains have been taken to make the book still more worthy of the favor with which previous editions have been received. In this revision it has not been thought advisable to depart from the original plan of the work—that of presenting a short history, which, while giving what is essential to a clear understanding of the subject, makes no pretence of being exhaustive.

It has been a source of great satisfaction to the authors, that, while their work has been criticised in matters of secondary importance, its spirit and the care with which it has been written have been recognized by Friends in general, as well as by the representative Journals of Quakerism—"The American Friend" (Orthodox), "The

Friends' Intelligencer" ("Hicksite"), "The Friend," Philadelphia, (Conservative), and "The Friend," London, (the representative of English Friends).

For the changes and additions in the present edition the writer of this Preface is wholly responsible, though he has had the benefit of a few notes made from time to time by his brother. It is impossible to estimate the loss which this edition has sustained from being deprived of the late Dr. Thomas's wide knowledge of existing conditions in the Society of Friends, a knowledge which was probably unsurpassed, combined as it was with an almost passionate devotion to the Society and its doctrines.

The difficulty of securing definite and accurate accounts of the events of the past few years has been great, and indulgence is asked for unavoidable errors and omissions. To the many friends who have kindly aided the writer in his work he extends grateful thanks.

ALLEN C. THOMAS.

HAVERFORD, PENNSYLVANIA,
Ninth month, 25, 1905.

NOTE. It has been with continued feelings of regret that it has seemed to be unavoidable to use the titles employed by the United States Census of 1890 to distinguish the different branches of those calling themselves Friends. To adopt the words of the fair-minded critic in "Friends' Intelligencer," this has been submitted to, "reluctantly, . . for the reason that some distinguishing names are evidently necessary, especially outside the Society, and that so far nothing better has been proposed." Strictly speaking, the names are unfair and inaccurate.

PREFACE TO FIRST EDITION.

THE following sketch of the history and doctrines of the Society of Friends in America is based on an independent examination of original records, documents, contemporary histories, journals, and other materials. To compress the history of two hundred and fifty years into less than one hundred and fifty pages has been no easy task;[1] and while great care has been taken to omit nothing of supreme importance, it is altogether likely that omissions will be found more or less serious. It is believed, however, that the account fairly represents the main lines of a remarkably eventful history.

In describing the various divisions which have occurred in the Society the aim has been to be impartial and, so far as practicable, let each side speak for itself. If any feel themselves not fully represented, indulgence is craved for unintentional shortcoming.

To those who have so kindly rendered aid in furnishing information and materials for use in the preparation of this sketch a grateful acknowledgment is due.

HAVERFORD, PA.,
Fourth month, 1894.

NOTE 1. This History first appeared as part of volume XII., American Church History Series, Christian Literature Co., New York, 1894.


Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2021 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

https://archive.org/details/historyoffriends0000unse

CONTENTS.

PAGE

INTRODUCTION : ORGANIZATION.—Yearly Meetings. —Organization.—Discipline.—"The Constitution and Discipline."—"The Five-Years Meeting." . . 11

CHAPTER I.—BEGINNINGS IN ENGLAND.—George Fox.—Early Missionaries.—Margaret Fell.—Doctrines.—"The Inner Light," etc.—Women as Preachers. 27

CHAPTER II.—DISCIPLINE AND DOCTRINE.—John Perrot.—Meetings for Discipline.—Declaration of Faith, 1693.—The Holy Scriptures.—Sufferings of Friends. 47

CHAPTER III.—EARLY YEARS IN AMERICA.—First Appearance in America.—Persecution in Massachusetts.—The Friends in Rhode Island.—Dispute with Roger Williams.—The Friends in New Netherland.—George Fox on Long Island.—The Friends in Virginia.—George Fox in Virginia and Maryland.—The Friends in Maryland.—The Friends in New Jersey.—William Penn and New Jersey. —Founding of Burlington.—The Friends in the Carolinas.—William Penn.—The Founding of Pennsylvania.—The Keith Schism. 61

CHAPTER IV.—THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.— Loss of Political Power in Pennsylvania.—Growth in Numbers.—Enforcement of Discipline.—"Middle Ages of Quakerism."—The Friends and Indians. —Friends and Slavery.—Emancipation of Slaves.— John Woolman.—Friends and the Revolution. . 101

CHAPTER V.—DIVISIONS DURING THE NINETEENTH

PAGE

CENTURY.—Hannah Barnard.—Elias Hicks.—Orthodox Party.—Elias Hicks and the Elders.—Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of 1827.—The Separation of 1827.—The Separations of 1828.—Joseph John Gurney.—John Wilbur.—"Wilburite" Separations.—Conferences at Baltimore, 1849, 1851, 1853.—The "Wilburites". 119

CHAPTER VI.—PERIOD OF REORGANIZATION.—FURTHER PROGRESS.—The "Hicksites."—Lucretia Mott.—Educational Institutions.—Doctrine.—The Orthodox.—Declaration of Faith.—Bible Society.—Travelling Ministers.—Slavery.—Anti-Slavery Separation in Indiana.—Whittier.—The Civil War.—Sufferings in North Carolina.—"Peace Association of Friends in America."—President Grant and his Indian Policy.—Philanthropic Efforts.—Education and Educational Institutions. 159

CHAPTER VII.—LATER YEARS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.—Causes of Declension.—Reawakening.—Change of Front.—Conference of 1887.—"Declaration of Faith."—The "Pastoral System."—Conference of 1892.—Foreign Missions. 191

CHAPTER VIII.—LATEST YEARS.—"American Friends Peace Conference."—"Primitive Friends."—"Wilburites."—"Hicksites."—General Conferences.—"Isolated Members."—Review.—Orthodox.—Conference of 1897.—Uniform Discipline and Union of Yearly Meetings.—Conference of 1902.—Five-Years Meeting.—Boards of Five-Years Meeting.—Results.—Foreign Missions.—Summer Schools.—Conclusion. 207

APPENDIX.—STATISTICAL TABLES.—BIBLIOGRAPHY. 225

INDEX. 243

THE FRIENDS IN AMERICA.

INTRODUCTION.

ORGANIZATION.

[In the following sketch the titles adopted in the United States Census of 1890 are used to distinguish the various divisions of the body calling itself by the name of "Friends," as "Orthodox," "Hicksites," "Wilburites," and "Primitive." These terms are used simply for the sake of distinction, and with no invidious meaning.]

THE Friends, in the United States and Canada are divided into Yearly Meetings, of which the "Orthodox" have fourteen, the "Hicksites" seven, and the "Wilburites" seven. As the organization is essentially the same in all, they may be considered together.[1] Each Yearly Meeting, as its name implies, meets annually, and exercises a jurisdiction over a certain amount of territory. The geographical extent of each varies, but altogether they include the whole territory on the continent, and all Friends belong to some one of the Yearly

[1] Since 1902 the Orthodox Yearly Meetings, except Philadelphia, Ohio, and Canada have been somewhat more closely associated than heretofore, through an organization known as The Five-Years Meeting. The Constitution of this meeting will be considered later.

Meetings[1] with the exception of the small bodies, styled "Primitive."[2] On all matters relating to faith and practice, with the exception of those who unite in the Five-Years Meeting (Orthodox), each Yearly Meeting is independent of all the rest, nor is it amenable to the others, either singly or combined. On rare occasions one Yearly Meeting may ask advice and assistance of others.[3] In the very early days, London Yearly Meeting was regarded in a rather indefinite way as a court of appeal, but voluntarily relinquished that position. It continues to send, in addition to the special "epistles" to each of the Orthodox Yearly Meetings, one that is known as the "London General Epistle," which is read in all the Yearly Meetings, but which is simply a message of Christian greeting. English Friends at times of dissension and separation have sometimes endeavored by friendly mediation to settle the difficulties.

[1] The Orthodox Yearly Meetings are (1905): New England, New York, Canada, Philadelphia, Baltimore, North Carolina, Ohio, Wilmington (O.), Indiana, Western (Ind.), Iowa, Kansas, Oregon, California. The Hicksite Yearly Meetings are: New York, Genesee (N. Y.), Philadelphia, Baltimore, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois. The Wilburite Yearly Meetings are: New England, Canada, Ohio, Western (Ind.), Iowa, and Kansas; to these can be added (1905) North Carolina, a separation having occurred in North Carolina 1904 and the separation having established a Yearly Meeting which claims affinity with the Wilburites.

[2] These have one "General Meeting" (Pennsylvania), etc.; and two "Quarterly Meetings," Scipio (New York), and New England.

[3] For example, Virginia Yearly Meeting (Orthodox) when it had become depleted by emigration consulted Philadelphia, Baltimore, and North Carolina, and on their advice united itself with Baltimore Yearly Meeting (Orthodox) in 1845. A number of other cases of less importance have occurred.

The Yearly Meetings belonging to each branch are not isolated from one another, but are united in various ways. (1) A member in one place is received as a member everywhere else by his own branch of the Society, and if he brings suitable official letters with him becomes an active member of the meeting to which he removes. (2) A minister if he removes into the limits of another Yearly Meeting is, on presenting the proper credentials, received, without further action, as a full minister.[1] (3) Ministers of one Yearly Meeting, who feel it right to travel and labor as preachers elsewhere, are received, if presenting proper credentials, without transfer of their membership, and are assisted in their work, they for the time being putting themselves under the authority of the meetings where they happen to be.[2] (4) Each Yearly Meeting addresses all the others belonging to its section of the Society every year an "epistle" expressing Christian sympathy and giving information as to its work.[1] This method of correspondence is, probably, unique, and has played an important part in the history of the denomination. When separations have occurred in one Yearly Meeting and both divisions send out epistles to the other Yearly Meetings, each of them decides which division to recognize; and whichever one is recognized has its epistle read

[1] Philadelphia Yearly Meeting (Orthodox) must be excepted from this statement.

[2] Except to some extent in Philadelphia Yearly Meeting (Orthodox).

and answered. By an unfortunate logical strictness the result of this has been that, if two Yearly Meetings having such a question before them should reach different conclusions, this alone has been considered sufficient reason for discontinuing correspondence with each other, for correspondence has been interpreted to mean indorsement of the position held, at least on Inter-Yearly Meeting matters.[1] (5) There are various Inter-Yearly Meeting organizations officially recognized. Thus the "Hicksites" have their Union for Philanthropic Labor, and on Indian Affairs, and the Orthodox have their Associated Committee on Indian Affairs, the Peace Association of Friends in America, and The American Friends Board of Foreign Missions (6) Delegated advisory conferences are held. Of these the Orthodox have held several, and in 1902 The Five-Years Meeting was established.[2] (7) The visits of ministers and other members of the one Yearly Meeting to other Yearly Meetings during their sessions is a very strong practical bond of unity. (8) Among the Orthodox, whenever a new Yearly Meeting is to be established the Yearly Meeting proposing the action asks the consent of the others.[3]

Each Yearly Meeting prepares and adopts its own Book of Discipline for the regulation of its

[1] It has been on this ground that the correspondence between Philadelphia Yearly Meeting and other Yearly Meetings has ceased.

[2] See pages 24–26.

[3] This is now done through the Five-Years Meeting.

own meetings and members. There is a very close resemblance between these Disciplines taken as a whole, though there are also wide divergencies.[1]

The Yearly Meeting is the unit of authority in the Society ; to it belongs every man, woman, and child who is counted in its membership. Every one of these has an equal right to speak on any matter that may be before the meeting, for it is not a delegated body. It is true that the meetings immediately next to it in rank send representatives (sometimes called delegates), but this is simply to insure a representation from the various quarters. Certain duties, such as the nomination of the chief officers for the year, devolve upon the representatives, and any matters may be referred to them as a convenient committee by the meeting at large. The meetings are organized by the appointment of a clerk and assistants. There is no president. The clerk combines the presiding officer and secretary in himself, but the discussions are not conducted on parliamentary rules.[2] A subject is introduced and freely discussed, and at the conclusion the clerk draws up what he believes to be the general judgment of the meeting as developed by the discussion, and reads it to the

[1] In 1901–1902 all the Orthodox Yearly Meetings except Philadelphia, Ohio, and Canada adopted a Discipline which is uniform, except where modified in minor points to suit special circumstances.

[2] In some Yearly Meetings (Orthodox), especially where the amount of business to be transacted in a limited time is great, it has been thought necessary to make use of methods similar to parliamentary ones.

meeting, and if it is approved it is recorded as the decision. No vote is taken, for the feeling is that in spiritual matters majorities are not safe guides, and among Friends the decision oftener turns upon the sentiments expressed by the more experienced and spiritually-minded members than upon the actual number of voices, though of course numbers have weight. The belief is that the guidance of the Lord is to be realized and followed in the business meeting, and there is therefore an entire absence of evidences of applause, or of motions and counter-motions. The practical result of this system is conservative, for the theory is that, so far as possible, any new step shall be taken as the united action of the meeting; and if a reasonable number, even though a minority, be dissatisfied with a proposition, it is either dropped or modified, the effort being to convince but not to force. Nearly all the separations that have occurred have been due to the neglect of this principle.

The position of women is one of absolute equality with men.[1] In most cases among the Orthodox the sessions are held with the men and women meeting together, in others separately. When the latter practice is followed the propositions adopted by one meeting are sent for approval to the other, where they may be rejected or adopted.

[1] This is not strictly correct as far as Philadelphia (Orthodox) is concerned, and perhaps is not fully the case as regards the business of the church among the "Wilburites," and "Primitive."

It is competent for a Yearly Meeting at any given year to make any change in its Discipline, though it is customary to appoint a committee to consider important changes for a year and then report.[1] The decisions of the Yearly Meeting are binding on all the meetings within the limits of its jurisdiction. It is also the only authoritative interpreter of the Discipline, and the final court of appeal. During its recess it is represented by an executive committee called the Permanent Board or Representative Meeting,[2] which holds sessions as stated times and upon special call. It has a few special duties, but is not allowed in any way to interfere with or to enforce the discipline.

In addition to this, the Yearly Meetings have standing committees on various subjects, such as peace, education, temperance, etc. The Orthodox bodies, with one or two exceptions, have also committees on home and foreign missions, evangelization, temperance, etc.

Every Yearly Meeting is divided into quarterly meetings. These meet four times a year,[3] and receive reports from the meetings which constitute them (monthly meetings). A summary of these reports is made and forwarded to the Yearly

[1] In those Meetings belonging to the Five-Years Meeting changes must be approved by the latter body.

[2] This committee, owing to the fact that the first object of its appointment was to assist members who were suffering for their principles, was called for many years the "Meeting for Sufferings," a name still retained in a few cases.

[3] In some cases these meet but three times or even only twice a year, in which case they are called four-months meetings or half-year's meetings, respectively.

Meeting. As in the Yearly so in the quarterly meetings, every member is entitled to take part in the discussions, the same order of procedure prevailing in them as in the former. The quarterly meeting takes cognizance of the action of the monthly meeting, and can be appealed to whenever dissatisfaction is felt with the action of a lower meeting. Its assent is required for the establishment of any new meeting within its limits. When a new quarterly meeting is to be established, however, the consent of the Yearly Meeting is necessary. It appoints its own committees on various lines of Christian work, and sends down word to the monthly meetings how much each meeting is expected to contribute toward the expenses of the Yearly Meeting.

The monthly meeting is the executive power so far as the membership is concerned, subject to appeal to the quarterly and Yearly meetings. In practical working, however, its acts are seldom criticised by its superior meetings, and its executive duties make it a most important body. It receives and on occasion can disown (i. e., expel) members, and it has the direct oversight of the congregations composing it. Its organization is similar to that of other "business meetings or meetings for discipline" (as they are called in distinction to the "meetings for worship"). In addition to this and its committees, its regular officers are elders and overseers. The duties of the former are, first, to encourage and counsel the

ministers, and second, to have a Christian care over the membership. In some places they hold office for life or good behavior, in others for a term of years. They are appointed by the joint action of the monthly meeting and the quarterly meeting of ministers and elders, which will be discussed presently. The overseers are (1) a committee to receive applications for admission to membership before being presented to the monthly meeting. (2) Their duty is to be on the lookout for any in the meeting in need of spiritual or temporal aid. (3) They are to admonish offenders and endeavor to restore them; and if they fail in this, they are to report to the monthly meeting for its action. (4) In some localities, they have special duties in regard to the holding of church property. (5) They prepare at stated times in the year answers to certain questions, called "queries," directed by the Discipline to be answered in order to show the condition of church life and progress. These answers are laid before the monthly or preparative meeting[1] for emendation or approval, and to be forwarded to the superior meetings.[2] They

[1] Preparative meetings are wholly subordinate to monthly meetings, and usually consist of but one meeting for worship. Their powers are small in America. When they exist it is chiefly for the purpose of sending answers to the queries and appointing delegates to the monthly meeting. Under the "Constitution and Discipline," (1900), Preparative Meetings have been abolished in those Yearly Meetings adopting the Discipline, though Monthly Meetings have the power to establish "local meetings for business."

[2] By the "Constitution and Discipline" (1900) Queries are read and seriously considered in Monthly and Quarterly Meetings

are appointed directly by the monthly meeting alone, and the length of their tenure of office varies in different places.

Ministers have not been referred to as regular officers. The reason of this has been that the organization is considered complete, as an organization, without them. The Disciplines require the appointment of elders and overseers, but do not require that of ministers. There is no provision in the Disciplines for their training at seminaries or otherwise.[1] The theory is that the church recognizes when the gift and the qualification have been committed to a man or woman, and acknowledges it, after which he or she is called an "acknowledged," "recommended," or "recorded" minister. There is no ceremony of ordination. The minister continues to follow his ordinary vocation, except when for the time being he is prevented from so doing by special religious service at home or abroad; in such case, if his work has the approbation of the meeting, his wants are supplied; but as minister he receives no salary.[2]

three times a year, but not answered. Annual reports as to the state of the church are forwarded to the Yearly Meeting through the Quarterly Meetings.

[1] There are at most, if not all of the Friends' colleges, courses in Biblical and Religious Instruction, but these are open to all students. Summer schools are frequently held both among the Orthodox and "Hicksites," where instruction is given in the Bible, Theological subjects, and in the best methods of practical religious work.

[2] The custom in this respect has been modified in many places among the Orthodox.

The acknowledgment, or recording, of a minister is accomplished as follows: A Friends' meeting for worship is supposed to be held under the immediate direction of the Spirit of Christ.[1] The congregation meets in silence, with no prearrangement of service;[2] there is no stated length for any sermon, prayer, or exhortation, and often several persons, not necessarily ministers, take part during the same meeting. If any speak in a way that appears to lack the evidence of having a right call, it is the duty of the elders to admonish such; if they speak with acceptance, the elders are to encourage and advise them. If one has spoken frequently and is seen to have a gift, it is acknowledged by the church and a record made of it; the action is in this case, as in that of the elders, taken conjointly by the monthly meeting and the quarterly meeting of ministers and elders.[3] The minister is the only officer, if such he can be called, who is not affected by change of residence beyond the limits of the monthly meeting.[4]

It remains now to consider the constitution of the meeting on "ministry and oversight," called also in many places the meeting of "ministers

[1] See p. 23.

[2] The custom in this respect has been modified in many places among the Orthodox.

[3] In some Yearly Meetings among the Orthodox certain doctrinal questions are asked of the ministers and elders, and no one is allowed by discipline to hold office unless these can be satisfactorily answered.

[4] This is not the case with Philadelphia Yearly Meeting (Orthodox).

and elders," and sometimes the "select meeting." In every Yearly Meeting the ministers and elders, in most places the overseers as well, and sometimes also persons appointed to sit with them, are required to meet together at regular times, generally every three months, to review the state of the membership and to consider the needs of the work, but without disciplinary powers. They are frequently the ones to propose a suitable person to the monthy meeting for acknowledgment as a minister. They also are required to read and consider, and often to answer certain "queries" applying especially to them as to doctrine, life, and practice; these are forwarded to a quarterly meeting of similar character, to which representatives are sent. This meeting is composed of the several monthly meetings on ministry and oversight within the limits of the ordinary quarterly meeting. It unites with the monthly meetings in the acknowledgment of ministers or appointment of elders, or, when need requires, in the removal of them from office. Once a year it forwards its summary of the reports from its lower meetings to the Yearly Meeting on Ministry and Oversight, (or of Ministers and Elders). The only duty of this latter meeting beyond that of advice and recommendation is to sanction the action of the monthly and quarterly meetings (of the general membership), or to refuse its sanction to consenting to ministers traveling on religious service beyond the seas.

This brings us to a peculiarity of the Society of Friends, which is its arrangement for its ministers traveling. When a minister feels it right to go to a place more or less distant to engage in some form of religious work, he asks the monthly meeting to which he belongs for liberty to go. When he expects to engage in a more extensive work it is required that he obtain the consent of the quarterly meeting as well. When the consent is obtained the clerks of the meetings give him a copy of the minute which states the action of the meeting. If the permission is refused, he is expected to remain at home. When he wishes to cross the ocean in his religious labor, the certificate is not complete without the indorsement of the Yearly Meeting on Ministry and Oversight[1] (or of Ministers and Elders). The discipline requires that a committee be appointed to see that such are suitably provided with pecuniary means for defraying expenses, etc.

Last in order, though first in importance, is the individual congregation known as the Meeting for Worship, the character of which is sufficiently described elsewhere.[2] Meetings are always held on the first day of the week, and usually on one week-day also.[3]

[1] Under the new "Constitution and Discipline" (Orthodox), the consent of the Yearly Meeting at large must also be obtained.

[2] See pp. 21, 56.

[3] It has been thought best (1905) to let the preceding paragraphs stand essentially as in previous editions, for the statements are still applicable to many of those calling themselves Friends.

As stated elsewhere,[1] conferences of all the Orthodox American Yearly Meetings were held in 1887, 1892, and 1897. At this last conference the subject of a uniform Discipline for all the Yearly Meetings was discussed, and a committee was appointed to prepare the draft of one to be presented to the Yearly Meetings. This was done, and by 1902 all the American Orthodox Yearly Meetings except Canada, Ohio, and Philadelphia had adopted "The Constitution and Discipline for the American Yearly Meetings of Friends."[2]

The Yearly Meetings which adopted the new Discipline thereby entered into a somewhat closer union than had before existed, though the bond is still a loose one. The association closely resembles the Confederation which existed between the States of the American Union before the adoption of the Constitution. The character of this union of the meetings is thus described in the Discipline itself:[3]—"Each Yearly Meeting is independent in the transaction of its business. Those Yearly Meetings which unite in this Constitution and Discipline, and, under its provisions, delegate

Important modifications have been made, however, in the organisation of the Orthodox body, owing to the adoption of a new general Discipline by most of the American Yearly Meetings (Orthodox), and these call for special notice.

[1] Chapter VIII.

[2] As stated elsewhere, Canada adopted the Constitution in 1900, but in 1901 re-considered the subject and reversed its action. The chief objection was that the document was not suited to their special needs. Ohio rejected it on the ground that it was not definite enough on points of doctrine. Philadelphia did not consider it at all.

[3] Constitution and Discipline, Part II, chap. 1.

certain authority to the Five-Years Meeting, retain their original independence, and in its exercise, grant the power hereinafter described. . . . . Each Yearly Meeting retains the authority to adopt additional disciplinary regulations not inconsistent herewith." [1]

Some of the more important results of the adoption of this Constitution are,—uniformity in the method of recording ministers; in granting certificates to ministers for traveling on religious service; in the appointment of Permanent Boards; and in the manner of transacting church business. The Constitution has abolished Preparative Meetings; it has substituted for the children of members "associate membership" instead of "birthright membership," and has provided an associate membership for adults.

While "pastors" are not mentioned by name, "pastoral service" is recognized and rules and advices concerning its exercise are laid down.

It provides for a meeting or conference once in five years of delegates [2] from all the yearly meetings which have adopted the Constitution; this

[1] Changes and modifications must be submitted to the next Five-Years Meeting for approval. Const. and Disc. Part II, chap. x.

[2] Delegates are chosen on the basis of numbers, and the same rule is followed as was observed in the case of the conferences of 1892 and 1897. "Each Yearly Meeting shall be entitled to five delegates, and to an additional delegate for each one thousand members or fraction thereof greater than five hundred." Part II, chap. xii., sect. 1. Unlike Yearly Meetings, the Five-Years Meeting is a strictly delegated body in which only delegates can take part.

conference to be called THE FIVE-YEARS MEETING.

The Constitution does not contain any creed or formal Declaration of Faith, though a general statement of belief is given. For more explicit statements of belief reference is made to those officially put forth at various times, and especially to the letter of George Fox to the Governor of Barbadoes in 1671, and to the Declaration of Faith issued by the Richmond Conference in 1887.

The Constitution is briefer, simpler, more logical than the Disciplines which preceded it, and is probably better fitted to present-day needs. On the other hand it is somewhat lacking on the spiritual side. While it has been subjected to some severe criticism, it has worked so far remarkably well.

CHAPTER I.

BEGINNING IN ENGLAND.

AMONG the many denominations which appeared in England during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, that time of religious upheaval, none is more worthy of attention than the Friends. Though scarcely one of its doctrines was absolutely new, yet the combination of so many radical tenets produced a remarkable factor in the religious economy of Christendom, the effects of which are only beginning to be appreciated.

"England had been stunned for twenty years with religious polemics. The forms of church government—presbyterianism and prelacy—the claims of the independents and the clamors of the sectaries, the respective rights of the pastors and the people, were discussed in every pulpit, they distracted every parish and every house."[1] Torn by civil war, agitated with bitter theological disputes, full of men dissatisfied with church, with state, with almost every existing institution, England was indeed in a sad way. It was amid such surroundings, influenced by such currents of

[1] J. B. Marsden, "History of the Later Puritans," 2d ed., London, 1854, p. 235.

thought, out of such a hurly-burly, that the Society of Friends arose.[1]

The history of the early years of the Society is the history of its founder.[2] George Fox was born at Fenny Drayton, sometimes known as Drayton, in the Clay, Leicestershire, July,[3] 1624. "My father's name was Christopher Fox; he was by profession a weaver, an honest man. . . . The neighbors called him Righteous Christer. My mother was an upright woman; her maiden name was Mary Lago, of the family of the Lagos, and of the stock of the martyrs."[4] His youth "was endued with a gravity and stayedness of mind that is seldom seen in children."[5]

Notwithstanding his sober and serious youth, he seems to have had no idea that he was to be called to any special work, and, as with many a man, a slight thing, apparently, proved the turning point in his life. Being asked to drink healths by some young men who were "professors" of religion, he

[1] William Thistlethwaite, "Lectures on the Rise and Progress of Friends," London, 1865, pp. 1–35.

[2] "The ideas of Quakerism came from many sources, foreign and English, but the formation of the Friends' Society was due to one man." G. M. Trevelyan, "England under the Stuarts," London, 1904, p. 312.

[3] The exact date is not known.

[4] "Journal" of George Fox, London, 1694, p. 1. This work is uniformly referred to as "Journal." We hear little or nothing of George Fox's relatives except now and then he simply mentions visiting them. (But see "Journal," pp. 390, 396.) Charles Marshall says, under date of "11th month, 19th, 1671": "I went to see G. F.'s mother in Leicestershire." ("Journal" of Charles Marshall, London, 1844, p. 17.) She died in 1674, "Journal," 396.

[5] William Sewel, "History of the Quakers," London, 1725, 2d ed., p. 6.

was so grieved that such persons should act in this way that he threw down his share of the cost of the previous entertainment and went out of the room. A sleepless night followed, during which he believed he heard the call of the Lord summoning him to leave all things. He went from place to place seeking peace of mind; once he says that "a strong temptation to despair came upon me, and then I saw how Christ was tempted, and mighty troubles I was in." He went from "priest to priest" to get help, but found them sorry comforters, for they did not see that he was one who needed spiritual food and enlightenment, not mental distraction. He remained more than a year in this state. At last, he writes, "about the beginning of the year 1646, as I was going to Coventry and entering toward the gate, a consideration arose in me how it was said that all Christians are believers, both Protestants and Papists. And the Lord opened to me that if all were believers, then were they all born of God and passed from death to life, and that none were true believers but such, and though others said they were believers yet they were not. Another time, as I was walking in a field on a First-day morning, the Lord opened to me that being bred at Oxford or Cambridge was not enough to fit and qualify men to be ministers of Christ; and I stranged at it, because it was the common belief of people."[1] He still did not find absolute peace,

[1] "Journal," pp. 3-6.

but continued to go up and down through the country.

After the conviction that education was no essential qualification of a minister, he naturally turned more and more to the dissenters, but he found little satisfaction with most of them. So he goes on to say: "When . . . I had nothing outwardly to help me, nor could tell what to do, then, oh, then I heard a voice which said, 'There is one, even Christ Jesus, that can speak to thy condition,' and when I heard it my heart did leap for joy."[1] And when he cried to the Lord, "'Why should I be thus, seeing I was never addicted to commit those evils?' the Lord answered that it was needful I should have a sense of all conditions—how else should I speak to all conditions? And in this I saw the infinite love of God. I saw also that there was an ocean of darkness and death, but an infinite ocean of light and love which flowed over the ocean of darkness."[2] Again he says: "Now was I come up in spirit through the flaming sword into the Paradise of God. All things were new, and all creation gave another smell unto me beyond what words can utter."[3] This was when he was about twenty-three.

The sentences quoted lie at the root of Fox's practice and teaching—consistency of the outward life with the profession; the necessity of divine

[1] "Journal," p. 8. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 13, 17. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 17.

power within the man to enable him to live in accordance with the will of God; the direct communication of this will to every believer in the Lord Jesus Christ. His labors were from first to last a comment on the text, "If we live by the Spirit, by the Spirit let us also walk." [1]

Fox does not seem to have preached, in the ordinary acceptation of the term, until late in the year 1647. And then, Sewel says, his preaching "chiefly consisted of some few but powerful and piercing words, to those whose hearts were in some measure prepared to be capable of receiving this doctrine." [2] Later, he became, perhaps, the most powerful preacher of his day. He spoke with a force and earnestness which were hard to withstand. He was truly inspired, speaking in a remarkable manner to the condition of those who heard him. "To hear Fox preach once in the churchyard as he passed through the town, or to spend an evening with him by the fireside, often was enough to change a persecutor into an enthusiast, to emancipate a man from the intellectual habits and social customs of a lifetime." [3] "He had," said William Penn (Preface to Fox's Journal), "an extraordinary gift in opening the Scriptures. . . But above all he excelled in prayer. . .

[1] Compare W. James "Varieties of Religious Experience," New York, 1902, pp. 7, 8.

[2] "Journal," p. 13; Sewel, p. 13; "First Publishers of Truth," London, 1904. pp. 47, 48.

[3] G. M. Trevelyan, "England under the Stuarts," London, 1904, pp. 312, 313.

The most awful living frame I ever beheld, I must say, was his in prayer."

There seems little doubt that, as Sewel says, many if not most of the early converts of Fox were those who, like himself, were believers in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, but, like him also, dissatisfied with the teachings and practices of the day, were longing for a higher and more spiritual life.[1] The meetings, which were at that time frequently held for discussion of points of doctrine, afforded Fox admirable opportunities for spreading his views. He speaks of a "meeting of priests and professors at a justice's house," "a great meeting at Leicester for a dispute wherein both Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists, and Common-Prayer men were said to be all concerned."[2] "This meeting was in a steeple-house," and as it is the first record of Fox entering one of those buildings to speak, it will be well to say a few words respecting the practice the early Friends had of entering places of worship, and, as is so often charged, of interrupting public worship.[3] It is true that there are instances of Friends disturbing public worship, but the number of cases has been greatly exaggerated. It was usually after the "priest" had finished that the Friend

[1] Trevelyan, as above, p. 313. [2] "Journal," pp. 14, 15.
[3] The phrase "steeple-house" is not peculiar to Friends, nor did they originate it; it is found, for instance, in Edwards's "Gangræna," the third edition of which was published before Fox began to preach. And other cases might be cited. ("Gangræna," etc., Thomas Edwards, 3d ed., London, 1646, part ii., p. 4.)

spoke, and then it was on account of the unpalatable doctrine, rather than for the interruption, that he suffered. The places of worship he entered were usually those belonging to the Independents, and this body allowed discussion after the sermon.[1] Fox frequently speaks of waiting until the minister had finished, and once at least he was invited up into the pulpit. A striking instance occurred at Ulverstone, where Margaret Fell, who, when he was interrupted as he was speaking *after* the "priest," called out, "Why may not he speak as well as any other?"[2]

Had it not been for his strong common sense, Fox might have gone through an experience somewhat similar to that of his adherent, James Nayler,[3] or have become a second Ludowick Muggleton.

Though one of the most mystical of modern reformers, Fox was at the same time one of the

[1] "After all this is done [praying, preaching by the pastor, etc.] they [the Independents] have yet another exercise, wherein by way of conference, questioning, and disputation every one of the congregation may propound publicly and press their scruples, doubts, and objections against anything which that day they have heard." ("A Dissuasive from the Errors of the Time," etc., Robert Baylie, London, 1645, p. 30. This book also was published before George Fox began to preach.

[2] "Journal," pp. 56, 57, 61, 78, 109; see also R. Barclay, "Inner Life," pp. 274–293. "First Publishers of Truth," London, 1904, p. 33; Bowden, vol. 1, pp. 73–81.

[3] Nayler is often quoted as an example to prove the wild enthusiasm of the early Friends; even so careful a writer as H. Weingarten being deceived as to the true character of the Nayler episode. ("Die Revolutionskirchen Englands," Leipzig, 1868, p. 271.) Nayler's actions were disavowed by Friends at the time, and he recanted, confessed his error, and was restored. (Sewel, pp. 147–155.) T. E. Harvey, "Rise of the Quakers," London, 1905, pp. 101–111.

most practical; all his spiritual teaching, from the very first, was accompanied not only by desires, but by efforts for the moral, political, and social welfare of his hearers; his Journal is full of practical suggestions. He "was the first who raised his voice against the evils of West Indian slavery. He claimed freedom of opinion in things pertaining to God. . . . He could not conceive of religion and morality apart."[1] "Instead of the military spirit he proclaimed the wickedness of all war. Instead of the reliance on force, he enjoined martyrdom. Instead of the suppression of vice, the influence of example. In place of the religion of gloom and reprobation he opened the inner well-springs of constant joy. In place of the hell waiting the sinner in the next world, he taught men to unfold the heaven that each carried hidden within himself on earth."[2]

No man was more absolutely truthful than he, no one could be more desirous to get at the very roots of things. It was this sincerity of character and purpose which led him to reject almost with scorn all language and manners which appeared to convey any impression other than the truth.[3]

It does not seem to have been the intention at first to establish a new branch of the church. Fox and his early adherents felt that their message was

[1] B. F. Westcott, "Social Aspects of Christianity," London, 1887, pp. 129, 130.

[2] G. M. Trevelyan, "England under the Stuarts," London, 1904, p. 314; for Fox's views on "War" see "Journal," pp. 275, 630.

[3] "Journal," p. 24.

to the church at large, but their testimony against "steeple-houses" and "priests" necessarily caused them to meet by themselves for worship, and probably before he or they realized it meetings for worship were actually established. Fox, however, soon recognized this fact, and wherever opportunity offered set up meetings. He tells us "that the truth sprang up first (to us, as to be a people to the Lord) in Leicestershire in 1644." This probably refers to his own personal experience. He goes on to describe how the movement spread first to the neighboring counties, then, by 1654, over England, Scotland, and Ireland. "In 1655 many went beyond seas," and "in 1656 truth brake forth in America."[1]

The number of his adherents rapidly increased, and they, like Fox, were filled with zeal to spread what was to them glad tidings to all people.[2] The

[1] "Epistles," London, 1698, p. 2.

[2] Fox's illiteracy has often been spoken of. If "illiteracy" means erratic spelling, and small knowledge of books, Fox was certainly "illiterate." (See Friends Historical Journal, vol. 1, p. 6, 1903.) But it must be remembered that spelling in Fox's day was largely phonetic, (J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps, in "New Lamps or Old," gives an instance where in a single entry of a Parish Register written, at the same time by the same man the same name in the same family is spelled three different ways.) On the other hand, if "illiterate" means "ignorant," Fox's Journal, Epistles, Tracts, the unanimous testimony of those who knew him best, and the manner in which he discomfited his accusers amply disprove the charge. See Sewel, p. 25. The fact remains that he influenced and retained the esteem and affection of men like Robert Barclay, William Penn, Thomas Ellwood, and many others—highly educated men. (See Sewel, p. 25, and Penn's preface to Fox's "Journal," Ellwood's "Autobiography,") While, as has been almost always the case in great religious revivals, his adherents were primarily drawn from the lower middle class, it was by no means exclusively so, and he was also joined

missionary activity of the early Friends has, perhaps, only been equaled in modern times by the Jesuits.

In a "General Epistle" dated 1660, "Germany, America, Virginia, and many other places, as Florence, Mantua, Palatine, Tuscany, Italy, Rome, Turkey, Jerusalem, France, Geneva, Norway, Barbadoes, Bermuda, Antigua, Jamaica, Surinam, and Newfoundland," are mentioned as having been visited by Friends. It is true that there was no systematic missionary effort, but even if, as was often the case, the visits were made singly, or two by two, the extensive service and the great expense, which was borne by the membership at large, show the true spirit of missionary enterprise.[1] The fact that little or no record remains of many of these visits does not show that they were made in vain.

It is clear that for some time no formulated statement of doctrine was made. "The purport of their doctrine and ministry," says William Penn, "for the most part is what other professors of Christianity pretend to hold in words and forms."[2]

heart and soul by the men just named, as well as by many others, such as Isaac Penington, Samuel Fisher, Margaret Fell, who with a hundred more would have adorned any Christian body. Some of his followers had been "priests." In the earlier years there seem to have been very few wage-earners among the converts.

[1] William Beck, "The Friends," London, 1893, p. 92. "Epistles," etc., London, 1858, p. ix., where a detailed account of receipts and expenditures is given, the latter amounting to £490 13s. 5d. (date, about 1659). See also Bowden, vol. i., p. 58.

[2] Preface to Fox's "Journal," p. xiii.; "Rise and Progress," p. 34.

But to this was added a belief in the direct revelation of Christ to the soul. "Now the Lord hath opened to me by his invisible power how that every man was enlightened by the divine Light of Christ, and I saw it shine through all. And they that believe in it came out of condemnation, and came by the light of life, and became the children of it; but they that hated it and did not believe in it, were condemned by it, though they made a profession of Christ."[1] "Now I was sent," Fox says, "to turn people from darkness to light, that they might receive Christ Jesus; for to as many as should receive him in his light I saw that he would give power to become the sons of God, which I had obtained by receiving Christ; and I was to direct people to the Spirit that gave forth the Scriptures by which they might be led into all truth and so up to Christ and God, as they had been who gave them forth. . . . I saw that the grace of God which brings salvation had appeared to all men, and that the manifestation of the Spirit of God was given to every man to profit withal."[2]

He and his followers saw that whenever there was a human soul, Christ Jesus, the Light of the world, had called that soul, and by his Spirit had visited it, that he might bring it to himself. We can imagine what a wonderful discovery this must have been to men brought up to believe

[1] "Journal," p. 22. [2] "Journal," p. 22.

in a limited salvation, open only to an elect few, or "discontented with second-hand truths."

What wonder that they felt constrained to tell all men that God was seeking their salvation, not their destruction, and that He was personally calling each one to himself. They thus presented an entirely different picture of God from that presented by the Puritans, and their zeal was such in those early days that the term Quaker meant, in the minds of a large numbers of outsiders, a people who were a terror to their religious opponents, an unanswerable puzzle to the magistrates, and whose "frenzy" neither pillory, whipping-post, jail, nor gallows could tame. It was this sense of the universality of the work of the Holy Spirit, and of the completeness of the salvation for each individual man through Jesus Christ, which not only made them so hopeful for the whole race, but also so ready to work for the bettering of mankind.

There was no one too high to be spoken to, no one too low to be considered. Thus we find Oliver Cromwell, the Pope, the Sultan visited, and the slave and Indian pleaded for. Absolute unhesitating obedience to what was believed to be the will of God was characteristic of Fox and his associates, and a knowledge of this fact will explain many things otherwise inexplicable. Matters which might to an outsider seem of little moment were held of supreme importance if believed to be required or forbidden as the case

might be. Expediency was a word that hardly possessed any meaning for them.[1]

He soon gathered a band of those who felt they were called to preach and exhort. There was no ordination, there was no formal recognition of their position, for there was no church organization; but by 1654 there were "sixty ministers"[2] traveling up and down. Many of these missionaries were young in years,[3] few beyond the prime of life. There seems to have been no organized arrangements for these ministers; they went wherever they believed the Lord sent them, whether it was to a neighboring county or to a distant land, though not infrequently counsel was taken with George Fox, when practicable, or with other Friends.[4] The adhesion of Margaret Fell, the wife of Judge Fell of Swarthmoor Hall, near Ulverstone, was a great support. She was a woman of remarkable attainments, great executive

[1] George Fox on one occasion when a pardon was offered him, refused to be released from a prison in which he had been confined for seven months, though he was very ill. He says: "I was not free to receive a pardon, knowing I had not done evil. . . . For I had rather have lain in prison all my days than have come out in any way dishonorable to truth." ("Journal," p. 405.)

[2] "Journal," p. 124; Sewel, p. 78. See also "First Publishers of Truth," London, 1904.

[3] James Parnell, James Dickinson, and William Caton began to preach at eighteen, the first dying in prison after most cruel treatment at nineteen; Edward Burrough died in prison at twenty-eight.

[4] "Journal" of John Taylor (1657), York, 1830, p. 85 (a reprint of ed. 1710); "Journal" of John Banks, London, 1712, pp. 65–68; "Truth Exalted," etc., John Burnyeat, London, 1691, pp. 21, 24, 27, etc.

ability, and excellent judgment. Her husband, Judge Fell, though he never joined the Society, was a powerful friend to it. Margaret Fell was a woman of property and position, and used both liberally in aid of the new movement.[1] She has been compared, and not without reason, to Lady Huntingdon among the early Methodists, Her house soon became the headquarters of the missionary band, her advice was sought and given, and though comparatively few of her own letters have been perserved, very many of those addressed to her are still in existence,[2] over four hundred being in the Devonshire House collection alone. There is no doubt also that at Swarthmoor Hall contributions were received for the expenses of those traveling and for the relief of those suffering for their principles. The funds thus received were distributed as occasion required. Many of the early preachers came from the neighborhood of Swarthmoor, which fact also helps to account for Margaret Fell's great influence.[3]

[1] "The Fells of Swarthmoor Hall," Maria Webb, 2d. ed., London, 1867, pp. 70 ff.; see also "Brief Collection," etc., Margaret Fox, London, 1710.

[2] "Letters of Early Friends," John Barclay, p. 25, note, London, 1841; M. Webb, p. 82. See Margaret (Fell) Fox's Testimony concerning George Fox prefixed to his "Journal"; also "Brief Collection," etc., Margaret Fox, London, 1710.

[3] Barclay, in his "Inner Life" (already referred to), pp. 268 ff., has sought to prove that Fox acted much like a modern missionary society in supplying ministers where they were needed, and in displacing those who were unsuitable. He also endeavors to show that there was a system of itinerant preaching nearly as complete as that of the later Wesleyans. Barclay appears to have made up his mind on these points and then to have set out to

No distinct creed was preached by this early band, but they called every one away from dependence upon anything but Christ himself. They directed their hearers to the light of Christ within their hearts. Fox loved to dwell on the light of Christ. "Believe in the Light, that ye may become children of the Light," was his message again and again. So much did he and his followers dwell on this, that though at first they called themselves "Children of Truth," they were soon termed "Children of Light,"[1] a name which they adopted and used for some time. They also called themselves "Friends of Truth," then "The Religious Society of Friends," to which was very frequently added, "commonly called Quakers." At present the usual name is simply

find evidence for his view. In bringing this forward he takes little account of the vast amount of testimony on the other side, and sometimes it would seem he even ignores what does not make for his side. A careful examination of his arguments, and of many of the official documents of the Society, of Croese's, Sewel's, and Gough's histories (the first two being contemporary accounts), as well as of many of the "Journals" of early Friends fails to confirm his position. It is incredible that Fox, with "his superhuman truthfullness," should never have mentioned such an arrangement in his "Journal." Barclay's work treats with great ability of subjects generally neglected by other historians, gives much curious information, and is the result of great labor and much thought. It is, therefore, the more to be regretted that the wide circulation of the book should have given currency to views regarding the Society of Friends which rest on insufficient evidence, if they are not largely erroneous. See an able criticism, "An Examen," etc., Charles Evans, M. D., Friends' Bookstore, Philadelphia, 1878; J. Winsor, "Narrative and Critical History of America," Boston, 1884, vol. iii., p. 504. The little book, "Letters, etc., of Early Friends," A. R. Barclay (editor), London, 1841, pp. 274 ff., alone almost disproves his position, the editor being R. Barclay's uncle!

[1] "Journal," p. 238; "First Publishers of Truth," p. 147.

"The Friends," and in some places "Friends' Church."[1]

The phrase "Inner Light" has also become inseparably attached to them and their successors.[2]

Accompanying this spiritual teaching there was the practical testimony against oaths, as being con-

[1] The origin of the name Quaker is thus described by George Fox himself: "This was Justice Bennet of Darby, who was the first that called us Quakers, because I bid them tremble at the word of the Lord. And this was in the year 1650." ("Journal," p. 37; "Doctrinal Works," London, 1706, p. 507.) So also Sewel, who adds, the name "hath also given occasion to many silly stories" (Sewel, p. 24. See Gerard Groese, "The General History of the Quakers," London, 1696, p. 5), stories which are repeated to this day. (See William Hand Browne, "Maryland," Boston, 1884, p. 135.) In the great Oxford English Dictionary under "Quaker," occurs the following extract and comment: "I heare of a sect of women (they are at Southworke) come from beyond sea, called Quakers, and these swell, shiver, and shake, and when they come to themselves (for in all this fitt Mahomet's holy-ghost hath bin conversing with them) they begin to preache what hath been delivered to them by the spirit." Clarendon Mss., No. 2624. "It thus seems probable that Bennet merely employed a term already familiar, and quite appropriate as descriptive of Fox's earlier adherents." This may be so, but it hardly seems likely that Justice Bennet should have been "familiar" with this small body in South London, whose existence was unknown until recently, and who are not mentioned under this name except in the single manuscript quoted above.

[2] There is no doubt that meanings have been attributed to this phrase widely different from that held by Fox. He says: "I turned the people to the divine light, which Christ, the heavenly and spiritual man, enlighteneth them withal; that with that light they might see their sins, and that they were in death and darkness, and without God iu the world; and that with the same light they might also see Christ, from whom it comes, their Saviour and Redeemer, who shed his blood and died for them, and who is the way to God, the truth, and the life." ("Journal," p. 168.) The phrase "Inner Light" is not used by Fox, or by the early friends so far as known. They said "the Light of Christ" (Sewel, 56, 95, etc.) or simply the "Light." For Isaac Penington's view, see his Works, 2d ed., London, 1761, vol. 1, pp. xxxviii, xxxix. For a modern discussion, see Rufus M. Jones, "Spiritual Law in the Social World," Philadelphia, 1904, pp. 159–176.

trary to the words of Christ, "Swear not at all;" against tithes, as being also contrary to the gospel, whose ministers were to freely give what they had freely received; against all language which departed from verbal truthfulness, such as titles of compliment;[1] the use of the plural form of the pronouns in address; of refusing to uncover the head to any man, regarding the act as one of worship, and to be practiced only toward God.[2]

It was the practice in those times to make a difference in the manner of speaking to equals and to superiors. "Thou" and "thee" were used to the former and to inferiors, but "you" to superiors. It seemed to many at the time, as well as at a later day, that Fox attached too much importance to language and to the hat, but it is difficult to judge correctly without an accurate knowledge of the period. The principle involved was right, and having accepted that, he carried it to its logical conclusion. The practice of calling the days and months by their numerical names

[1] Legal *bona fide* titles, as king, duke, justice, etc., were excepted.

[2] This fact explains the tenacity with which the early Friends held to this testimony, believing that to take off the hat was giving the honor to men which was due to God only. (Fox's "Journal," p. 179, and many other places.) "There was nothing which brought more abuse on these scrupulous reformers. In vain they explained that they did not mean it disrespectfully. Many were hurried away and cast into prison for contempt of court without any other crime being proved against them." (M. Webb, Fells of Swarthmoor Hall, pp. 31, 32.) See also W. James, "Varieties of Religious Experience," New York, 1902, pp. 291–296.

was not original with him, it was a custom among the early Baptists as well. As to dress, there is absolutely nothing to show that Fox advised anything but simplicity ; uniformity he does not hint at ; that was the product of a later age. His "leather breeches" have become famous through Carlyle,[1] but there is no authority whatever for the statement that he stitched them himself, and the material seems to have been chosen for its wearing qualities alone.[2] He himself bought for his wife a piece of red cloth for a mantle.[3]

In addition to those already mentioned, was the testimony against all war as contrary to the Gospel. Fox took this position, as early as 1650: he says, "I lived in the virtue of that life and power that took away the occasion of all wars." And in 1654 in a letter to Cromwell, "I was set of God to stand a witness against all violence, and against the works of darkness ; and to turn people from darkness to light, and to bring them from the causes of war and fighting to the peaceable Gospel."[4]

The views of Fox spread, and thousands flocked,[5] to hear and to accept the comforting doctrines proclaimed by these earnest men and women.

[1] "Sartor Resartus," book iii., chap. 1.
[2] Sewel, p. 12.
[3] M. Webb, Fells of Swarthmoor Hall, p. 259. See also "Epistles," vol. 1, p. 55 ; William Thistlethwaite, "Lectures on the Rise and Progress of Friends," London, 1865, pp. 126–133.
[4] "Journal," pp. 46, 137, 285, 630.
[5] Thurloe, "State Papers," vol. v., p. 166 ; vol. viii., pp. 403, 427, etc.

Fox's acceptance of the universality of the gospel, and of the direct visitation of every soul by the Holy Spirit, logically brought him to see that women could not be excepted from any part of the divine commission.[1] Though the number of women who preached was somewhat less than that of men, those that preached took an active part in the work at home and abroad, and were full partakers, even to death, in the sufferings of the early days. Their contributions to the literature were considerable. Altogether, women held a higher place than in any contemporary church organization.

The early meetings for worship which sprang up all over the kingdom appear to have been congregational at first, and the beginnings of organization were strikingly like the apostolic practice. Fox, in 1652, thus writes to Friends: "Be faithful to God, and mind that which is committed to you, as faithful servants, laboring in love; some threshing and some plowing, and some to keep the sheep: he that can receive this, let him; and all to watch over one another in the Spirit of God."[2] This was Fox's ideal meeting, and the whole organiza-

[1] One of the first if not the very first of Fox's converts was Elizabeth Hooton, who was also the first preacher after Fox. (Bowden, vol. 1, p. 261). Fox's statement of his views on the position of women in a letter to the Duke of Holstein is remarkably clear and convincing. ("Journal," pp. 523 ff.) Fox did not, however, introduce women's preaching into the modern church. Edwards, in his "Gangræna," mentions the fact of women's preaching more than once. (See part i., pp. 26, 113, London, 1646.)

[2] Fox's "Epistles," Epistles 16, London, 1698, p. 15.

tion afterward developed by him is based on the principle involved in these words. Like the early church, one of the first objects was the care of the poor, "and to see that all walked according to truth." [1]

[1] "Letters, etc.," of "Early Friends," p. 311.

NOTE.—The admirable little book by T. Edmund Harvey, "The Rise of the Quakers," London, 1905, has come to hand too late to be made much use of.

CHAPTER II.

DISCIPLINE AND DOCTRINE.

AS numbers increased, necessity for some formal organization plan naturally suggested itself, though from the first, as Fox's "Epistles" and those of other Friends clearly show, the spirit of order and discipline was always present and carried out, though informally. Individual monthly meetings for discipline were set up, certainly as early as 1653, in Durham, and elsewhere in the northern counties,[1] but the practice was occasional. Among the earliest held were "general meetings," which were held for discussion, for advice, and to take into consideration all matters of common interest. The first of which any record remains was held at Swanington, Leicestershire, 1654; another was at Balby, Yorkshire, in 1656, which issued a number of directions and advices; and from this time such meetings were held frequently. In 1660 Fox mentions a meeting at Skipton "for business relating to the church both in this nation and beyond the seas." He states also "this meeting had stood

[1] Fox's "Journal," pp. 310, 321, 419; "Letters, etc.," pp. 283, 286, 311 ff.; "Epistles from Yearly Meeting of Friends held in London," etc., Historical Introduction, London, 1858, vol. i., pp. vii. ff. "First Publishers of Truth," London, 1904, 1905.

for several years, and part of the business was to consider the cases of those who had suffered for truth's sake, and to help the poor." [1]

Quarterly meetings were established contemporaneously with monthly meetings, and for similar purposes. The quarterly meeting of the present day was a later development.

Even in 1666, though there were many meetings for discipline, some even in America,[2] it still was not a general practice. The occasion for the setting up of so many meetings of discipline is one of the most curious episodes in the history of the Society. George Fox had been in prison most of the time for three years, and during this period, missing the restraint of his personal presence and the guidance of his sound judgment, not a few Friends had run into extremes. One of the most radical was John Perrot, a preacher who had been very active, "and though little in person, yet great in opinion of himself; nothing less would serve him than to go and convert the Pope." [3] Perrot on reaching Rome was confined as a madman. After great difficulty his release was secured. On his return to England his eccentricities were great, but the sufferings he had undergone gave him position, and his ability in speaking gained him adherents. He taught that "unless they had an immediate motion at that time to put it off," the

[1] "Journal," p. 215; Sewel, p. 93.
[2] Bowden, vol. I., p. 208.
[3] "History of the Life of Thomas Ellwood" (an autobiography), London, 1714, p. 241.

hat should be kept on in time of public prayer, both by the one praying and by those worshiping with him. This teaching spread; some very prominent Friends being temporarily led away by it to a greater or less degree, among them Isaac Penington, Thomas Ellwood, and John Crook.[1]

To Fox, who was a most reverent man, this teaching was abhorrent;[2] he speaks of Perrot's followers as those who "had run out from the truth." He held several meetings with them "which lasted whole days," and reclaimed a number who, Thomas Ellwood says, with great simplicity and humility of mind acknowledged their "outgoing" and took condemnation and shame to themselves.[3]

Fox's good sense saw something must be done to avoid, as far as possible, such schisms in the future. Ellwood's statement is so clear that it deserves to be quoted: "Not long after this, G.[eorge] F.[ox] was moved of the Lord to travel through the countries, from county to county, to advise and encourage Friends to set up monthly

[1] In the MS. Records of Virginia Yearly Meeting there is a copy of a letter from Isaac Penington expressing sorrow at his being partly led away, and asking the Virginia Friends to give up or destroy certain papers "written by me in time of great darkness and temptation." He also says: "It was God's mercy that he [John Perrot] did me no more hurt than he did; and for that of the hat, I did not practice it myself nor desire that others should practice it, but only that the tender-hearted might be borne with in that respect." Dated "London, the 29 of the 3rd mo. [May] 1675." There is a letter of the same date from John Crook very much to the same effect, and speaking of "a paper writ by me about 12 years since." Virginia Yearly Meeting of Friends, MS. Minutes, "28 of 8th month [October] 1675."

[2] Fox's "Epistles," 251–253.

[3] Fox's "Journal," p. 310; Ellwood's "Autobiography," p. 244.

and quarterly meetings, for the better ordering the affairs of the church; in taking care of the poor; and exercising a true gospel discipline for a due dealing with any that might walk disorderly under our name; and to see that such as should marry among us did act fairly and clearly in that respect."[1] To these functions might be added: recording the sufferings of Friends, and extending aid to those in prison and to their families; keeping records of births, marriages, and deaths; and other minor matters.

The admirable system of meetings and records thus instituted by Fox has lasted with little alteration to the present day. Fox's practical mind is well illustrated on this journey by his advising Friends at Waltham to set "up a school there for teaching boys, and also a women's school at Shacklewel for instructing girls and young maidens in whatsoever things were civil and useful in the creation."[2] His efforts were not confined to England, but he wrote to Scotland, Holland, Barbadoes, and other parts of America advising the same course. Thus it is seen that not only was Fox a founder but a skillful organizer; He did not accomplish this work without opposition. Two well-known ministers, John Wilkinson and

[1] "Autobiography," p. 245; Fox's own account, "Journal," pp. 310 ff.

[2] "Journal," p. 316. See also his "Instruction for Right Spelling, Reading and Writing," or "Spelling Book," so-called, prepared in connection with Ellis Hookes, London, 1673, several times reprinted.

John Story, opposed him, partly, Sewel says, from envy, and partly because things were not ordered as they wished. The ground taken by them was, "that every one ought to be guided by the Spirit of God in his own mind, and not to be governed by rules of man." They were also opposed to women's meetings. They gathered a number of adherents, and at one time threatened much trouble; but, in Sewel's quaint words, "at length they decayed and vanished, as snow in the fields." [1]

At first all meetings for discipline were "men's meetings"; but Fox soon saw the advantage of women's meetings also, as being better adapted for looking after the members of their own sex, "and especially in that particular of visiting the sick and the weak, and looking after the poor widows and fatherless." [2]

Fox wrote many epistles to individuals and to meetings regarding good order in the church, dwelling on the necessity for Christian love and practice. To write epistles was a very common thing both for meetings and individuals to do, and valuable collections have been made of such.[3]

The first Yearly Meeting held in London ap-

[1] Sewel, p. 561; also "Journal" of Charles Marshall, London, 1844, p. 26; "Journal of Friends' Historical Society," vol. 1, pp. 57 ff., London, 1904; Thomas Hodgkin, "George Fox," London and Boston, 1896, pp. 248–250; John S. Rowntree, "Micah's Mother," London, 1893. The controversy lasted thirty-six years.

[2] "Letters, etc.," pp. 293, 309, 343; Fox's "Journal," p. 386; William Crouch, "Posthuma Christiana," London, 1712, p. 22.

[3] "Letters, etc.," 1657, 1659, 1662, 1666, pp. 287–318. Fox's "Epistles," 359, 361–389.

pears to have been in 1661, and these meetings were continued with occasional intermissions. The first Representative Yearly Meeting was held in 1673. In the next four years "Public Friends" (ministers) only attended, but from 1678 to the present time there has been no intermission in the annual sessions of Representative Yearly Meetings.[1] In 1905 the Yearly Meeting met in Leeds, Yorkshire, the first time it has met outside of London since 1671. In 1668, it is likely that the most formal document prepared up to that date was issued. This is often known as the "Canons and Institutions," and there seems little doubt that Fox was the author, as it bears his signature. This document was practically the Discipline of the Society for a long time. R. Barclay, in his "Inner Life" says that it is found at the commencement of the records of every quarterly meeting which had been hitherto inspected by him bearing date 1669. The writer of the present sketch found it in the beginning of the Virginia Records, which state that they were begun "in the year 1673 by the motion and order of George

[1] The Yearly Meeting held at London appears to be the continuation of that held at Skipton beginning in 1656. Several were held at London from time to time, but it was not until 1671 that Yearly Meetings were regularly held in London. They have continued to be held annually without interruption ever since. "Letters," pp. 311–317; "Epistles," 1, pp. vii. ff.; W. Beck and T. F. Ball, "The London Friends' Meetings," London, 1869, pp. 53 ff.; "Journal of The Friends' Historical Society," London, 1905, vol. 2, pp. 59–63. It should be noted that in the earlier years, perhaps indeed as late as 1700, the term "Yearly Meeting" did not necessarily imply a meeting for business.

Fox, the servant of God." There are nineteen different heads, under which are grouped appropriately advices and regulations concerning almost all matters which would be likely to come up before a church organization. They largely relate to matters of practical morality and Christian oversight and care.[1] The title "Canons and Institutions," was formally disclaimed by the Friends in 1675.

No document exactly answering to a creed has ever been put forth by the Society as a whole, though a number of declarations of faith have been issued from time to time; but these have been rather for the benefit of outsiders, or in answer to charges preferred, than for the members of Society. One of the earliest formal statements was that made by Edward Burrough in 1658.[2] John Crook in 1662 published "Truth's Principles," avowedly a statement of the doctrines held by the Friends.[3] Another statement

[1] The document is printed in full in "The London Friends' Meetings," by William Beck and T. Frederick Ball, London, 1869, pp. 47 ff.; also in substance by R. Barclay, "Inner Life," p. 395.

[2] "A declaration to all the World of Our Faith," etc., works of Edward Burrough, 1672, pp. 439 ff. "The Design of Christianity," etc., John Crook, London, 1701, pp. 355 ff.

[3] "Truth's Principles, or those Things about Doctrine and Worship which are most surely believed and received amongst the People of God, called Quakers," etc., London, printed in the year 1662. This little book was reprinted at least sixteen times previous to 1803, and was translated into French and Welsh. John Crook's note to the edition of 1699 is interesting. In it he says, speaking of objectors: "They persist to object that we have altered our religion and that our ancient Friends held grievous errors; I am therefore willing in the eighty-first year of my age that the following treatise should be reprinted, that they

in 1671, was addressed by George Fox and his companions, while in the island of Barbadoes, to the governor of that island. This is so comprehensive that it has been quoted and referred to by the Society more than any similar document. As it is a defense against "false and scandalous reports," more stress is laid upon those points which Friends had in common with other Christian bodies than those in which they differ;[1] in fact some of the fundamental principles of Friends are untouched; for instance, that of the immediate communication of the will of God.

The earliest formal statement by the Society was a document put forth in 1693. This action was due to the charges preferred by George Keith, who, after having been a prominent member, left the Society and became one of its bitterest enemies,[2] and "charged the Quakers with a belief which they never had owned to be theirs, [and] they found themselves obliged publicly to set forth their faith anew in print which they had often before asserted both in words and writing, thereby to manifest that their belief was really orthodox, and agreeable, with the Holy Scriptures."[3] This document remains one of the best

may see what myself with our ancient Friends, held in the year 1663. This little book is also reprinted in "Friends' Library," Philadelphia, vol. 13, pp. 275–292.

[1] "Journal," pp. 357–361; "Christian Discipline," pp. 2–6; and in the Disciplines of all the Yearly Meetings up to 1900.

[2] See chapter iii., Pennsylvania.

[3] Sewel, pp. 618–625, who gives the document in full. It has been reprinted in part in most of the Disciplines of the Yearly Meetings.

statements of the Quaker faith. It was probably the work to a large extent of George Whitehead, who nearly forty years before was one of George Fox's band of sixty ministers. The widely known "Apology" of Robert Barclay, though published in 1678,[1] was not regarded as an official statement, neither was it specially referred to by the Friends of the seventeenth century.

The main points of the teaching of Friends must be gathered from various documents issued at various times. Accepting the ordinary fundamental doctrines of Christianity, they differed from other denominations in several important respects,[2] which may be grouped under the following heads: (1) The importance attached to the immediate personal teaching of the Holy Spirit or "Light within," or "Inner Light—this lay at the root of most of their "testimonies"; (2) The disuse of all types and outward ordinances; (3) The manner of worship and of appointment of ministers; (4) The manner of

[1] Originally published in Latin under the title "Theologiæ veré Christianæ Apologia," Amstelodami, 1676, but afterward translated by the author into English, as "An Apology for the True Christian Divinity," 1678, and reprinted many times. It has not been sufficiently noted that Barclay's celebrated book is really an answer to the Westminster Confession and the Shorter Catechism. A comparison of the "Apology" with the "Catechism" will show the connection.

[2] These differences were far greater in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth centuries than at present, not only in doctrine but in practice; e.g., the liberty to decline to take judicial oaths, which privilege the Friend died to uphold. Through his efforts this is now the right of every one in America, and also in England of all who can show that they have conscientious scruples against taking an oath.

carrying into daily life and practice the commands of Christ.

Their teachings in regard to the Spirit and in regard to oaths, dress, and language have been sufficiently indicated in the preceding pages. In disusing the ordinances of Baptism and the Supper, they believed, first, that there was no command for their continuance; and secondly, that as the spiritual baptism and spiritual communion were essential there was no need for the outward sign; and they also held that the use of the type tended to beget reliance upon the type. Dependence upon the immediate guidance of the Holy Spirit led the Friends to meet for divine worship in outward silence, as it was only under such circumstances that the Holy Spirit could call for what service he would, and from whomsoever he would. They believed that nothing should come between the soul and God but Christ, and that to make the worship of a whole congregation depend upon the presence or absence of one man was contrary to the idea of true worship. Ministers, they held, were called and qualified of God, and so the exercise of their gifts was not to be dependent upon education or upon any special training;[1] that the gift of the ministry was bestowed upon men and women alike. They believed in carrying gospel precepts into daily life more than most

[1] Education was not undervalued, but highly esteemed, as has been seen in George Fox's recommending the establishment of schools; but this was for all persons alike.

of their contemporaries, and all their dealings were to be in strict accord with their religious profession. War, as has been said, they held, was clearly antagonistic to the commands of Christ, and contrary to the whole tenor of a gospel of love and peace.

Their views in regard to the Holy Scriptures have been much misunderstood. This has been due partly to the way in which they often expressed their views, and partly from readers not paying due attention to the context, from not examining other writings, or from being ignorant of the real practice of the early Friends. George Fox "had an extraordinary gift in opening the Scriptures"[1] and it is well known he carried a Bible with him; few persons have been more familiar with the Bible than he, or been able to make a more ready use of it, as his Journal abundantly testifies. The Bible which he gave to Swarthmoor meeting is still preserved in Swarthmoor Meeting-house. Samuel Bownas at times preached with his Bible in his hand.[2] The extreme literalism of the age led the early Friends to make use of language to which their antagonists gave meanings often quite foreign to the real facts. Barclay's words, "We shall also be very willing to admit it as a positive certain maxim, that whatsoever any do pretending to the Spirit,

[1] William Penn, Preface to Fox's "Journal," see also Sewel, p. 12.
[2] "Life," pp. 7, 23, 100, London, 1795.

which is contrary to the Scriptures, be accounted and reckoned a delusion of the devil," are a fair statement of the general belief.[1]

Their views as to marriage and the marriage ceremony are peculiar, and were laid down by Fox himself as early as 1653.[2]

Marriage "is God's ordinance, and not man's," "We marry none," "we are but witnesses of it."[3] The man and the woman were to take themselves as man and wife in the presence of God's people; the clearness from all other engagements being ascertained, and consent of parents and guardians obtained.[4] The Friends were faithful to this testimony; "to such an extent did the care respecting

[1] R. Barclay, "Apology," Prop. III., § vi. It must be confessed that Barclay himself, when he terms the Scriptures a "secondary rule," uses language likely to convey a wrong impression. "It is not the Scriptures without the Spirit, nor the Spirit contrary to the Scriptures, but the Spirit's discovering the will of God in the heart, or opening of the Scriptures in its own time and way, and not in or by the will of man but as itself pleaseth . . . . which giveth the perfect sound and saving knowledge." John Crook, "Truths Principles," London, 1662, p. 7.

[2] "Journal," p. 315. [3] Fox's "Epistles," p. 281.

[4] "And when they do go together, and take one another, let there not be less than a dozen friends and relations present (according to your usual order), having first acquainted the men's meetings, and they have clearness and unity with them, and that it may be recorded in a book." ("Canons and Constitutions," 1668; "The London Friends' Meetings," p. 47; Virginia MS. Records, 1673.) The Friends' meetings before giving consent to a marriage were required to see that there was no existing engagement, that there was no legal obstruction, and that if there were children of a former marriage, that their rights should be carefully protected. (See also Fox's "Journal," p. 315; Sewel, p. 667; Penn's "Rise and Progress," 7th ed., London, 1769, pp. 43 ff., also the Disciplines of the various Yearly Meetings.) At present, applications for permission to marry are made to monthly meetings, which appoint a committee to see if anything stands in the way, and on its report, if satisfactory, give permission.

marriages . . . prevail in the Society . . . that [in England] prior to 1790 the man had to attend twelve distinct meetings for discipline, to repeat in public his intention of marriage, and the intentions were announced twenty times prior to the solemnization of the marriage." [1]

The Friends, with no boastful feeling, but with the desire that the record should stand as a testimony and as a memorial, directed that "sufferings of Friends (of all kinds of sufferings) in all the countries be gathered up and put together and sent to the General Meeting, and so sent to London." The result has been that a remarkable and detailed record of sufferings for conscience' sake has been preserved. "The severity and extent of their sufferings is shown by the fact that during the twenty-five years of Charles the Second's reign 13,562 Friends were imprisoned in various parts of England, 198 were transported as slaves beyond seas, 338 died in prison or of wounds received in violent assaults on their meetings." [2] This does not include those who suffered in America, among whom were four who were executed on Boston Common.[3]

[1] R. Barclay, "Inner Life," p. 407.

[2] William Beck, "The Friends," p. 65.

[3] Joseph Besse, in his "Collection of the Sufferings of the People called Quakers" (from 1650 to 1689), used the records referred to above, and in his volumes (London, 1753), may be found the details, geographically and chronologically arranged, with full indices. It should be said that the sufferings of Friends did not cease with 1689, either in England or in America, but they were chiefly on account of refusal to pay tithes. Their sufferings in America will be referred to in the following chapter.

[NOTE.—The authority for the statements made in the text is to be found in "Christian Discipline," etc., London, 1883; the Disciplines of the various Yearly Meetings; William C. Westlake, "The Sure Foundation," London, 1860, pp. 11–36; Thomas Evans, "Exposition of the Faith of the Society of Friends," Philadelphia, 1828 (frequently reprinted); William Penn, preface to Fox's "Journal," reprinted as "Rise and Progress of the People called Quakers," in many editions (Philadelphia, Friends' Book-store); R. Barclay, "Apology," "Friends' Library," vol. i, pp. 109–141, Philadelphia, 1837; John S. Rowntree, "Quakerism Past and Present," London, 1859; also his, "The Society of Friends, its Faith and Practice," London, 1901. See also, T. Edmund Harvey, "The Rise of the Quakers," London, 1905.]

CHAPTER III.

EARLY YEARS IN AMERICA.

[Note.—All dates before 1752 are Old Style.]

OWING to the disorders in England, the colonists of Massachusetts Bay had increased rapidly in numbers by 1656. It would naturally be supposed that, having left England largely on account of religious persecution, they would be ready to establish religious liberty in their new home. Nothing was further from their thoughts. The express purpose of their coming was to do as they pleased in regard to religious matters. Stern and unbending opponents of toleration, one of their first acts was to send back two Episcopalians. Another episode was the banishment of Roger Williams. Scarcely were they clear of him, before Anne Hutchinson and the Antinomians rose up; then the Anabaptists. "Fines, imprisonment, whipping, etc.,[1] were brought into use to clear the colony of these dangerous heretics. If the colonists felt in this way toward those differing with them who had already appeared, it is not to be wondered at that they felt still more strongly in

[1] Neal, "New England," vol. i., p. 291.

regard to the Quakers, against whom, however, there was in 1656 no law.[1]

The first recorded visit of any Quakers in Massachusetts was that of two women, Ann Austin and Mary Fisher, who arrived in a vessel from Barbadoes in the beginning of July, 1656. As soon as Richard Bellingham, the deputy-governor, heard of their arrival, he sent "officers aboard who searched their trunks and chests and took away the books they found there, which were about a hundred, and carried them ashore, after having commanded the said women to be kept prisoners aboard, and the said books were by an order of council burned in the market-place by the hangman." The women were then brought on shore, put in prison, all persons forbidden to speak to them under penalty of five pounds; pens, ink, and paper were taken away from them, and a board nailed before the window that no one might see or speak to them. Worse than this, they were stripped perfectly nude and subjected to an outrageous examination to see if they were witches. All this was done, it should be remembered, before trial and before there was any law against the Quakers. After an imprisonment of five weeks, during which they were cruelly treated, they were put on board the vessel and sent back to Barbadoes.[2] Two days after they left, a vessel

[1] Hutchinson, "Massachusetts," vol. i., p. 197.

[2] Sewel, p. 156; Bishop, "New England Judged, etc.," London, 1703, pp. 8 ff.; Besse, vol. ii., pp. 177 ff.; Bowden, vol. i., pp. 33 ff.; Hallowell, "Quaker Invasion," pp. 32 ff.; Brooks

arrived from London with eight of the hated sect on board. One can imagine the horror of the magistrates. The master of the vessel was forced to take them back to England.[1]

It was while these were still in prison that the first law directly aimed against the Quakers was passed, strictly an *ex post facto* one so far as the prisoners were concerned. It is dated "Boston, 14 of October, 1656."[2] It begins: "Whereas, there is a cursed sect of heretics lately risen up in the world which are commonly called Quakers, who take upon them to be immediately sent of God and infallibly assisted by the Spirit to speak and write blasphemous opinions, despising government and the order of God in church and commonwealth," etc. Heavy penalties were provided for the master of any vessel who might knowingly bring a Quaker into the colony, while any of the sect who might come from any direction were to be "forthwith committed to the house of correction, and at their entrance to be severely whipped and by the master thereof, be kept constantly to work, and none suffered to converse or speak with them." Any person importing, concealing, etc.,

Adams, "Emancipation of Massachusetts," pp. 128 ff.; George E. Ellis, "Memorial History of Boston," James R. Osgood & Co., Boston, 1882, vol. i., pp. 177 ff.; G. E. Ellis, "The Puritan Age in Massachusetts Bay," Boston, Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1888, pp. 408 ff. (the last two are a defense of the Puritans); Bryant and Gay's "History of the United States," Chas. Scribner & Sons, New York, 1878, vol. ii., chap. viii.

[1] Hutchinson, "Massachusetts," vol. i., p. 197.

[2] Mass. Records, vol. iv., part i., pp. 277 ff.; Hallowell, pp. 133 ff.; Besse, vol. ii., p. 179; Bowden, vol. i., p. 46, etc.

"Quaker books or writings concerning their devilish opinions," was to suffer heavy penalties likewise.

Notwithstanding this law, the Quakers continued to come, and on October 14, 1657, the second law against them was enacted, and severer penalties prescribed.[1]

A third law, enacted May 19, 1658, forbade the Quakers holding meetings, those attending being fined ten shillings and those who might speak five pounds, with further penalties for old offenders. But this was not enough, for on October 19th of the same year, and May 22, 1661, it was provided that banished Quakers who might return were to suffer death.[2] Space does not allow a description of even one of the punishments inflicted under these laws; suffice it to say that the laws were rigorously carried out, even to the hanging on Boston Common of three men and one woman. These cruelties, and particularly the executions, having been brought to the notice of Charles II., he issued the "King's Missive," which reached Boston shortly before the day fixed for the execution of one of the sufferers, Wenlock Christison, and he and his fellow-prisoners to the number of twenty-seven were set at liberty.[3]

[1] Mass. Records, vol. iv., part i., pp. 308 ff.
[2] *Ibid.*, vol. iv., part ii., pp. 2, 321, 345.
[3] Bowden, vol. i., p. 226; Bishop, pp. 335 ff.; Neal, vol. i., p. 314; Hallowell, "Quaker Invasion," pp. 55, 189–191; Besse, vol. i., preface, p. xxxii., and p. 225. See Whittier's poem, "The King's Missive."

This action, however, only applied to the punishment of death, for a year later the laws, so far as whipping, e tc., were concerned, were re-enacted with but little modification. In May, 1681, the death penalty was formally repealed, and on March 23, 1681–82, the laws were suspended.[1] There was no whipping after 1677, though Friends suffered imprisonment for their refusal to pay tithes, etc. Even the Plymouth colonists made use of whipping, disfranchisement, fines, banishment.[2] Friends were always ready to pay their share toward the expenses of the civil government, but they would not pay tithes.[3]

It may be said, as it has often been said, "The Quakers brought all this suffering upon themselves; why did they 'intrude' themselves where they were not wanted?" It may well be said in reply, Why should they have stayed away? They were Englishmen, with all the rights of Englishmen. Wenlock Christison on his trial appealed to the laws of England, asking the pertinent question, "How have you power to make laws repugnant

[1] Mass. Records, vol. iv., part ii., pp. 4, 19, 34, 59, 88; vol. v., pp. 60, 134, 322.

[2] Bowden, vol. i., p. 294; MS. Records, Sandwich Monthly Meeting, "8th mo., 2, 1674, 4th mo., 4, 1675, 6th mo., 1705" ("Thos. Bowman in prison for priest's rates"); Bishop, pp. 164 ff.; Bowden, vol. i., pp. 75 ff.

[3] Hallowell, "Pioneer Quakers," p. 51; Sandwich Monthly Meeting Records, "3d mo., 9, 1712." Two Friends report that they have found out the proportion between the priest's rates and town and county charge, "and the priest's part, which Friends cannot pay, is near about one half, lacking half a third of the whole."

to the laws of England?" and declaring that the patent had been forfeited. There is no doubt whatsoever that he was legally correct in claiming that his legal rights were violated.[1]

Much has been made by Massachusetts historians and apologists of one or two women who divested themselves of the whole or part of their clothing, and then marched up and down the streets. Such apologists forget the age, and also that these acts were not done until after persecution had goaded the sufferers into what seems to this century to be a most unseemly exhibition. But while there were only two or three such episodes, the *laws* of Massachusetts, passed presumably after deliberation, directed that women should be "stripped naked from the middle up, tied to a cart's tail, and whipped through the town and from thence" to the next town and until they were conveyed out of "our jurisdiction."[2] This was done not once or twice, but again and again, most cruelly. It was a rude age, and both Friends and Puritans must be judged by the standards of the time in which they lived. The records, how-

[1] For a full statement see Hallowell's "Quaker Invasion" and "Pioneer Quakers"; Brooks Adams, "Emancipation of Massachusetts"; Charles Francis Adams, "Massachusetts, its Historians and its History." The last author discusses in a trenchant manner the spirit of the Puritans. See also Bowden, vol. i., pp. 243 ff.; Bishop, p. 337.

[2] Mass. Records, vol. iv., part ii., p. 4; Hallowell, "Quaker Invasion," p. 142; Besse, vol. ii., p. 227. George Fox and John Burnyeat, in their "New England's Fire-Brand Quenched," use this argument well, pp. 32, 184, 196, 197, 224. (Quoted in Hallowell.)

ever, show that the magistrates and church officers were the ones primarily responsible for the persecutions, for there is scarcely a single instance where the people at large manifested their approval of the cruelties practiced, while their disapproval was frequently shown.[1]

It was not until 1724 that the Quakers received the reward of their long endurance. In 1723 some Friends were appointed assessors in Dartmouth and Tiverton, and being conscientiously scrupulous of assessing taxes for the support of the ministers of the churches, were cast into prison and fined. Having made ineffectual application to the colonial government, they appealed to the Royal Privy Council in England. This sustained them on all points, remitted the heavy fines imposed, and ordered their release after thirteen months' confinement. This "marks the collapse of the effort made by the Puritans to establish a theocracy in Massachusetts."[2] Laws exempting Anabaptists and Quakers from supporting the ministers were passed in 1728 and later.

Notwithstanding the persecutions in New England, the Society grew in numbers, but particularly in Rhode Island, where under the liberal charter

[1] The defense of the magistrates is a curious document. Mass. Records, vol. iv., part ii., p. 386; vol. v., p. 198; Gough, vol. i., p. 393, who discusses it section by section.

[2] Gough, vol. iv., pp. 218–226, where papers are given in full, as also in Hallowell, "Pioneer Quakers," pp. 57–70; Brooks Adams, "Emancipation of Massachusetts," p. 321; "Acts and Resolves of the Province of Massachusetts Bay," Boston, 1814, vol. ii., p. 494, etc.

and administration they found a safe refuge. As early as 1666 they were of sufficient strength in the colony to cause the General Assembly to refuse a proposition for enforcing an *oath* of allegiance, and in 1667 their views were regarded still more.[1] Many of the influential men embraced Quaker doctrines, three of whom, Nicholas Easton, William Coddington, and Henry Bull, filled the office of governor. In 1672 the governor, deputy-governor, and magistrates were Friends, and the colony was largely if not wholly under their control. This circumstance was an extraordinary one not only in the history of the colonies but in the world, for it is doubtless the first example of any political community being ruled by men who believed strictly in the principles of peace. Nothing occurred to test their peace principles for some time: a law, however, was passed (1673) exempting from penalty those who had conscientious scruples against military service, but not relieving them from civil duties, and requiring all to aid in carrying out of danger women, children, and weak persons, also "to watch to inform of danger." In 1675, however, their peace principles were severely tried. The colony was asked to join with the other New England colonies in preparing for the Indian War then impending, but she, the governor being William Coddington, declined to join in the war. This course was not pleasing to the majority of the colonists of Providence Plantations.

[1] Bowden, vol. i., p. 296.

Though the latter suffered, Warwick being burnt and Providence set on fire during the war, those on the island of Rhode Island escaped.[1]

Sandwich, Massachusetts, monthly meeting seems to have been the first established in America,[2] and Scituate was established before 1660.[3] There is no reason for doubting that a Yearly Meeting was regularly held on Rhode Island from 1661, when it was set up.[4] This makes New England Yearly Meeting as it was subsequently called, the oldest Yearly Meeting in the world, except that of London.

It was in 1672 that Roger Williams made his proposal for a disputation with Friends; but though Roger Williams speaks of George Fox *slily* departing, there is no reason to suppose that Fox had not left before the challenge reached Newport. Roger Williams engaged to maintain fourteen propositions in public against all comers. He was met in debate by John Burnyeat, William Edmundson, and John Stubs in the presence of a great crowd who were gathered in the Friend's Meeting-House.[5] Burnyeat rightly characterizes

[1] Bowden, vol. i., pp. 306 ff.; Edmundson, pp. 76 ff.

[2] The records are preserved from 1672, the first entry being "4th mo. [June] 25, 1672." These were personally examined by the writer of the present sketch.

[3] "Mass. Hist. Soc. Collections," Second Series, vol. x. (see Duxbury); also Bowden, vol. i., pp. 207, 296.

[4] Bishop, p. 351. Burnyeat, p. 47, describes the meeting in 1672. See also "Letters, etc.," p. 313; Fox, "Journal," p. 366; Bowden, vol. i., p. 280.

[5] Roger Williams, who was about sixty-five, rowed himself in an open boat to Newport, a distance of thirty miles.

the propositions as "charges." They may be judged from the following: "2ly that ye Christ yt they profess is not ye true Lord Jesus Christ . . . . 4ly That they doe not owne ye holy Scriptures. . . . 6ly That their Prinsipels: & profession are full of Contradictions and Hipocrisies."[1]

As Roger Williams speaks of Edmundson as "rude," and Edmundson of him as "the bitter old man," the dispute must have been a stirring one. Burnyeat says Roger Williams "could not make any proof of his charges to the satisfaction of the auditory." Three days were consumed at Newport, and one day at Providence, Edmundson and Stubs being the defenders there. Each side was satisfied that it had gained the victory. Williams clearly had the weaker side, as he really was very ignorant of the true views of the Society of Friends.[2] He was not silenced, however, for he wrote an account of the incident and defended himself in "George Fox digged out of his Burrows," styled by Fox "a very envious and wicked book."[3] This was replied to by Fox and Burnyeat by "A New England Fire-Brand Quenched."

[1] For Roger Williams's letter and complete list, see "Historical Magazine," New York, 1858, vol. ii., p. 56.

[2] Edmundson, pp. 64 ff.; Burnyeat, p. 53; William Gammell, "Life of Roger Williams," Sparks's "American Biography," vol. iv., Boston, 1864, pp. 187–190; James D. Knowles, "Memoir of Roger Williams," Boston, Lincoln, Edwards & Co., 1834, p. 338; O. S. Straus, "Roger Williams," New York, 1894, pp. 218–221.

[3] "Journal," p. 432. Professor Gammell says that it is "distinguished by a bitterness and severity unequaled in any other of his [Williams's] writings." ("Life," pp. 187–190.)

These two books are good examples of the language which even the religious men of the seventeenth century allowed themselves to use.[1]

Connecticut followed the example of Massachusetts, and on the recommendation of the Council of the United Colonies the General Court of Hartford passed an act similar to that of Massachusetts, October 2, 1656; this was amended so as to be more effective against "loathesome heretics, whether Quakers, Ranters, Adamites, or some other like them." In 1658 corporal punishment was added.[2] New Haven passed similar laws, and executed them more severely. Humphrey Norton, in 1657, being imprisoned was put into the stocks, flogged on his bare back till the bystanders through their strong expressions of disapproval stopped it; he was then branded deeply on his right hand with the letter H, signifying heresy, and sent back until his fines were paid, which was done by a perfect stranger, a Dutchman, out of compassion;[3] and Norton was banished in addition. Other instances of persecution took place, but none so severe.[4] Connecticut and New Haven never were fruitful fields for Quaker missionaries.

[1] Both books are rare; Williams's has, however, been reprinted. "Burrow's" in the punning title refers to Edward Burrough, Fox's able coadjutor. An account of the incident will be found in Henry M. Dexter's "As to Roger Williams," Boston, 1876, but the author all through the book is very unfair toward the Quakers. See Hallowell's "Invasion," pp. 61, 73–75.

[2] "Colonial Records of Connecticut," J. H. Trumbull, Hartford, 1850, pp. 283, 303, 324.

[3] Besse, vol. ii., p. 196; Bishop, p. 203.

[4] Burnyeat, pp. 54–58; Edmundson, pp. 82 ff.

The first Friends in New York appear to have been on Long Island, and to have come from Massachusetts and Connecticut. Long Island, at least as far as Oyster Bay, was under the jurisdiction of the Dutch. Gravesend was settled almost wholly by the English, some of them Anabaptists, and others refugees from the intolerance of Massachusetts. One of the most prominent was a Lady Moody, who joined the Friends and had a meeting at her house.[1]

The first Friends who visited New Amsterdam (New York) were Robert Hodgson and four companions, three being women, who landed in August, 1657. At first they were courteously treated by Stuyvesant, the governor, but afterward two of the women, who had held a meeting in the street, were arrested, cast into prison, and finally put on board a vessel bound for Rhode Island. Robert Hodgson went on to Gravesend, where he was arrested and, with two women who had entertained him, brought back to New Amsterdam. The women, who were very roughly treated, were discharged, but Hodgson was sentenced to work two years at a wheelbarrow with a negro, or pay a fine of six hundred guilders. He refused to do either, and was most barbarously treated. Finally he was released at the intercession of the sister of Stuyvesant, without paying a fine or working.[2]

[1] Croese, part ii., p. 157.

[2] Bishop, pp. 213 ff.; Whiting, "Truth and Innocence," p. 121 (bound with Bishop); John Romeyn Brodhead, "History of the State of New York," New York, Harper & Brothers, 2d ed., vol.

Persecution was not confined to visitors. Inhabitants of Long Island were subjected to heavy fines, imprisonment, forfeiture of goods, and banishment. The severe punishments ended sooner in the New Netherlands than in Massachusetts, for on April 16, 1663, the enlightened Directors at Amsterdam a few weeks after the arrival in Holland of John Bowne, a banished Friend, not only gave him permission to return, but sent a letter to Stuyvesant breathing the true spirit of toleration. Among other things they said: "We very much doubt if vigorous proceedings against them [the Quakers] ought not to be discontinued except you intend to check and destroy your population, which, however, in the youth of your existence ought rather to be encouraged by all possible means. . . . The consciences of men, at least, ought ever to remain free and unshackled. Let every one be unmolested as long as he is modest; as long as his conduct in a political sense is irreproachable, as long as he does not disturb others or oppose the government. This maxim of moderation has always been the guide of the magistrates of this city, and the consequence has been that, from every land, people have flocked to this asylum. Tread thus in their steps, and, we doubt not, you will be blessed." [1]

i., pp. 636 ff.; Bryant and Gay, "History of the United States," vol. ii., pp. 239 ff.

[1] Bowden, vol. i., pp. 309–326; Croese, book ii., p. 157; Bishop, pp. 213 ff., 422 ff.; Besse, vol. ii., pp. 182, 237; Brodhead, vol. i., pp. 705–707.

Friends increased rapidly on Long Island, and were visited by many traveling ministers, some of whom suffered much.[1] John Burnyeat came in 1666 and again in 1671, when he says he "was with them at their Half-Year's Meeting at Oyster Bay;" at the second Half-Year's Meeting, at the same place, "in the meeting for business" he found those who "rose in a wrong spirit against the blessed order of the truth. . . . And chiefly their envy and bitterness was against George Fox and his papers of wholesome advice, which he in the love of God had sent among Friends." Burnyeat was successful, before he left, in satisfying "Friends in general" of the errors of these people.[2] This is the first meeting for discipline in New York of which there is any record, though Burnyeat's account clearly implies such meetings were nothing new.[3]

But the most important visit was that of George Fox himself, who, on his way from Maryland to New England, attended the Half-Year's Meeting at Oyster Bay. In company with him were John Burnyeat, Robert Widders, and George Pattison. This was the spring of 1672. The meeting, Fox says, lasted four days, beginning on the First day of the week. "The first and second days we had publick meetings for worship, to which the people

[1] Bishop, p. 424.

[2] Burnyeat, pp. 35, 40–42. The opposition was due to John Perrot's influence. Bowden, vol. i., p. 329,

[3] The first official records yet found read: "At a men's meeting the 23rd day of 3rd month [May] 1671."

of the world of all sorts might and did come. On the third day of the week were the men's and women's meetings, wherein the affairs of the church were taken care of. Here we met some of the bad spirit, who were run out from truth into prejudice, contention, and opposition to the order of truth and to Friends therein." He would not allow the disputes to come up in the regular meetings, but appointed a special meeting for the "discontented," "where as many Friends as had a desire were present also." "The gainsayers" were confounded, and "some of those that had been chief . . . began to fawn upon me and to cast the matter upon others." The force of the schism was ended.[1]

After his visit to Rhode Island and other places in New England, already referred to, Fox returned to Long Island in the sixth month (August), and held a number of meetings at Oyster Bay, at "Rye on the Continent," at Flushing, and at Gravesend.

William Edmundson, who visited Long Island a second time in 1676, found Friends troubled with "Ranters—i.e., men and women who would come into Friends' meetings singing and dancing in a rude manner, which was a great exercise to Friends." He remained some time, and says he reclaimed many.[2]

[1] "Journal," pp. 365, 366. Burnyeat names the "chief," and proved it "under his own hand," p. 46. Bowden, vol. i., pp. 329 ff.

[2] "Journal," p. 94. These "Ranters" may be the ones referred

The objection of Friends to oaths, and military service, and also their method of solemnizing marriages brought upon them fines, distraints, imprisonment, disfranchisement, and disqualification for holding office.[1]

The meetings in Westchester County were settled from Long Island, and as early as 1686 a Quarterly Meeting was held at Westchester.

By a minute of New England Yearly Meeting 14th of 4 mo., June 1695, a "general meeting" was authorized to be held at Flushing, Long Island. From that time to the present New York Yearly Meeting has been regularly held.[2] The Friends must have increased rapidly, for on February 22, 1687, Governor Dongan reports "an abundance of Quaker preachers, men and women." [3]

The first Friend who visited Virginia was Elizabeth Harris, who must have come in 1656, possibly in 1655. She appears to have persuaded a number to embrace her views. In 1657 Josiah Coale

to in a petition from the inhabitants of Huntington, L. I., 1677, against Quakers who disturbed public worship. "Documentary History of New York," vol. iii., p. 209.

[1] "Documentary History of New York," vol. iii., pp. 603–612; "Documents Relating to the Colonial History of New York," Albany, 1856, vol. iii., p. 415; vol. v., pp. 978, 983, 984.

[2] First known as "the Yearly Meeting held at Flushing," then as New York Yearly Meeting. It was held at Flushing until 1777, then at Westbury until 1793, when it was adjourned to be held in New York City. The first regular meeting for worship in New York City was probably in 1681. A house may have been built in 1698, but it is doubtful; one was built in 1774. James Wood, address "Bi-Centennial Anniversary of New York Yearly Meeting," New York, 1895, pp. 7–38; also in "American Friend," vol. 2, pp. 551 ff.

[3] "Documentary History of New York," vol. i., p. 116.

and Thomas Thurston came on their way to New England. Their coming created an uproar; they were thrown into prison, and, when released, required to leave the country. In 1658 an act banishing the Quakers was passed. In 1661, after the restoration, of Charles II. an act was passed requiring all persons to contribute to the support of the established (Episcopal) church. Friends were to be fined twenty pounds per month for absence from church, and their own meetings were forbidden under heavy penalties. In 1662 all who refused to have their children baptized were to be "amerced two thousand pounds; half to the informer, half to the public." In 1663 the Quakers were specially named: it provided "that if any Separatists above the age of sixteen years to the number of five or more assembled at any time and at any place to worship not according to the laws of England," they were to be fined for the first and second offense, but to be banished for the third. Masters of vessels and those entertaining Quakers were to be heavily fined.[1]

The Episcopalians in Virginia seemed desirous of rivaling the Puritans and the Dutch in persecution, but there are fewer instances of personal cruelty. One was that of George Wilson, who, after being severely whipped, was confined in a loathsome dungeon in Jamestown, where, "in

[1] Neill, "Virginia Carolorum," pp. 252, 292 ff.; Bancroft, "United States" (last revision), vol. i., p. 448; Bowden, vol. i., pp. 339 ff.

cruel irons which rotted his flesh," after a long imprisonment he laid down his life.[1]

The Society of Friends in Virginia was not only troubled from without but also from within. Nowhere, perhaps, in America was the schism of John Perrot so strong. He had gone to the West Indies and America to propagate his views, and had visited Virginia. Many were attracted by his teachings and led away, so that some did not meet together in a meeting once a year, and "were become loose and careless." At the height of this movement John Burnyeat visited the colony, 1665–66, and earnestly labored for the restoration of the erring. He was very successful in his mission.[2]

Burnyeat's efforts were ably seconded by William Edmundson, who arrived soon after the former's departure. During his visit he went to see Governor Berkeley, whose brother he had known in Ireland; but the governor was "peevish and brittle." Some one told Edmundson, however, that the governor must have been in a good humor, as he had not called him "dog, rogue, etc."[3]

In November, 1672, George Fox and four companions on their return from New England visited Virginia, and held many large meetings, setting up meetings for discipline, and confirming and extending the work of Burnyeat and Edmund-

[1] Bishop, p. 351.
[2] Burnyeat, pp. 34, 43.
[3] "Journal," pp. 60 ff.

son. It is said that the number of the Society was about doubled through George Fox's preaching, many of the prominent colonists being converted.[1]

It might have been supposed that in Maryland, as in Rhode Island, the Quakers would have found rest if not a welcome, but such was not the case. Though there are good reasons for believing that Elizabeth Harris was in Maryland during 1657, the first positively recorded visit was that of Josiah Coale and Thomas Thurston in 1658, for whose arrest a warrant was issued in July of that year, because they had been in the province over a month without taking the oath of fidelity; and two weeks later, on account of their "insolent behavior" in standing "presumptuously covered," they were forever banished, on pain of being whipped from constable to constable. Those who had entertained them and a man who had refused to assist in the arrest of Thurston were whipped.[2]

There were many refugees from Virginia in Maryland, as well as many other persons in the colony, who were without preachers. To such

[1] "Journal," pp. 375–382; Bowden, vol. i., p. 354. The opening entry of the Records of Virginia Yearly Meeting states: "This booke begun in the year 1673 by the motion and order of George Ffox, the servant of God." (MS. Records Virginia Yearly Meeting.) Virginia Yearly Meeting, first held at Pagan Creek, Isle of Wight County, was afterward held at various places until 1845, when it was joined to Baltimore Yearly Meeting.

[2] Besse, vol. ii., p. 380; Neill, "Founders of Maryland," p. 131; Archives of Maryland, "Proceedings of Council," 1636–67, pp. 348–353, 364, 494; J. Saurin Norris, "The Early Friends in Maryland," Md. Historical Society, Baltimore, 1862, pp. 6–9; J. Thomas Scharf, "History of Maryland," vol. i., p. 268.

these earnest preachers were most welcome. In 1659 William Robinson and others visited Maryland without hindrance. But during the Claiborne troubles a militia was organized, and Friends suffered much from fines and distraints on account of their refusal to bear arms or contribute funds. The names of thirty who thus refused and the detailed account of property seized are preserved, showing that they were well-to-do.[1] In 1660 persecution ceased, and, with a slight exception in 1662, for sixteen years there was no act of intolerance. The Perrot heresy, however, was rife, among the adherents being Thomas Thurston.[2]

In April, 1672, John Burnyeat "appointed a meeting at West River, in Maryland, for all the Friends in the province, that I might see them together before I departed. . . . And when the time appointed came, George Fox with several brethren came from Jamaica and landed at Pertuxon, and from thence came straight to the meeting." There was a very large meeting, which continued for several days, and "a men-and-women's meeting for the settling of things was set up. . . . G. F. did wonderfully open the service thereof unto Friends, and they with gladness of heart received advice in such necessary things."[3]

[1] Besse, vol. ii., pp. 378 ff.; Neill, "Founders of Maryland," p. 149.

[2] Burnyeat, p. 33.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 43. See also Fox's "Journal," p. 364, who says "five or six justices of the peace" and the speaker of the Assembly were present, besides "many of the world's people." (J. S. Norris, "The Early Friends," pp. 12 ff.)

This meeting, the first for discipline in Maryland, was the beginning of what was afterward known as Baltimore Yearly Meeting, and has been held regularly ever since.

George Fox held meetings and established meetings for discipline at various places on both sides of Chesapeake Bay. One interesting episode of this visit was the effort to reach the Indians. He had two "good opportunities with the Indian emperor and his kings" on the eastern shore, and was listened to with the deepest attention. On his return from New England in September, 1672 he visited Maryland a second time, when he held many meetings, and some with the Indians. The meetings among the colonists were largely attended, sometimes a thousand being present. His account of this journey is most graphic.[1]

"His labors had been incessant; neither wintry sleet nor the burning sun detained. He forded streams, slept in the woods and in barns with as much serenity as in the comfortable houses of his friends, and was truly a wonder unto many." [2]

Fox's visit appears to have been the occasion of starting a regular correspondence, first between the Friends of England and America, then of America as well.[3]

[1] "Journal," pp. 372–375.
[2] Neill, "Founders of Maryland," p. 145.
[3] Bristol Friends wrote to those of Maryland, "24th of 9th mo. [November], 1673." (Bowden, vol. i., pp. 355, 377.) Epistolary correspondence with London Yearly Meeting has been kept up to the present day.

The sufferings of Friends in Maryland were small in comparison with those in other colonies, and the fines and imprisonments which they underwent were almost wholly on account of their testimonies against tithes, oaths, and military services. From 1674 until they gained, in 1702, the privileges they sought, petition after petition in regard to oaths was made to the Assembly and Council, and more than once favorably considered by one or both bodies, only to be ignored or refused by the proprietaries.[1] Meantime the Friends grew in numbers and in influence, so strong, indeed, that largely through their opposition the act for the establishment of the Protestant religion, in 1691, was rendered inoperative; an act passed in 1694 forbidding the Roman Catholic worship was repealed in 1695, through their influence and that of the Catholics. Again, these two bodies used all their power to prevent the Episcopal Church being made the established church, but were only partly successful. The Friends were more successful in February, 1702/3, in getting the law modified as far as "Protestant dissenters and Quakers" were concerned.[2]

[1] Archives of Maryland, Proceedings of Assembly, 1666–76, pp. 354, 492; Proceedings of Council, 1687–8–93, pp. 57, 221; Neill, "Founders of Maryland," p. 164; Bowden, vol. i., pp. 382 ff.; Besse, vol. ii., pp. 383–388; J. Thomas Scharf, "History of Maryland," Baltimore, 1879, vol. i., p. 270; George Petrie, "Johns Hopkins University Studies," vol. x., pp. 35 ff.; Janney's "Penn," p. 106; T. C. Gambrall, "Early Maryland," New York, 1893, p. 199.

[2] Scharf, vol. i., pp. 365 ff.

The first Friends in New Jersey appear to have settled along the Raritan River in 1664;[1] in 1670 a meeting was settled at Shrewsbury, where a meeting-house was built; in 1672 George Fox and his companions visited the Friends at this place and also at Middletown.[2]

In 1674 Berkeley, one of the proprietors, sold his half of the province of New Jersey to John Fenwicke and Edward Billinge for £1000. Both of these men were members of the Society of Friends, and there is some reason to think that the acquisition was made for the benefit of the Society at large. A difference having arisen between these two men, William Penn was chosen arbitrator, who made an award. Edward Billinge became embarrassed in his circumstances, and he assigned his property to three of his fellow-members, one of whom was William Penn.[3] This was the beginning of William Penn's personal interest in America. The subsequent circumstances which led to the division of New Jersey into East and West Jersey and the disputes with Fenwicke cannot be entered into here. John Fenwicke with a company of emigrants landed June, 1675, on the shores of Delaware Bay, at a place they named Salem. Meantime William Penn and his co-pro-

[1] Bancroft, (Last Revision), vol. i., p. 521; Bowden, vol. i., p. 387.

[2] "Journal," pp. 365, 370; Burnyeat, p. 45; Edmundson, p. 92.

[3] "Two West Jersey Tracts" (Reprint), New York, 1880. Thomas Shourds, "History of Fenwick's Colony, etc.," Bridgeton, N. J., 1876.

prietors issued a statement of their views in regard to the government of the province. They said: "Thus we lay a foundation for after ages to understand their liberty as men and Christians, that they may not be brought into bondage but by their own consent; for we put the power in the people. . . . No person to be called in question or molested for his conscience or for worshipping according to his conscience."[1] The charter of West New Jersey, known as the "Concessions and Agreements, etc.," dated "3rd day of March, 1676/7," consisting of forty-four chapters, is drawn up in the spirit of the words just quoted.[2]

In 1677 two hundred and thirty Friends emigrated in a body to the new province. So striking a circumstance as this attracted even royal attention, and it is said that as the ship was about sailing King Charles II., who was "in his barge pleasuring on the Thames, came alongside and gave them his blessing."[3]

The emigrants from this ship founded Burlington in 1677; other emigrants followed, so that by 1681 fourteen hundred had come thither, mostly Friends. Their just treatment of the Indians not only secured them from molestation, but brought them supplies of maize and venison. They were

[1] S. Smith, "History of New Jersey," p. 80; New Jersey Archives, vol. i., p. 228. See also Edmundson, pp. 92, 94.
[2] New Jersey Archives, vol. i., pp. 241 ff.; Smith, Appendix, pp. 521 ff.
[3] Smith, p. 93.

"zealous in performing their religious service, for, having at first no meeting-house to keep public meeting in, they made a tent or covert of sail-cloth to meet under;" they then met in private houses until a meeting-house could be built.[1] By common agreement, "for the well ordering of the affairs of the church" a monthly meeting was set up "the 15th of the 5th month [July], 1678." At the next meeting "it was agreed that a collection be made once a month for the relief of the poor and such other necessary uses as may occur, . . . to be collected the First day before the Monthly Meeting."[2] On "the 4th of 7 month [September] 1679," "it was also desired that Friends would consider the matter as touching the selling of Rum unto Indians [if it] be lawful at all for Friends professing truth to be concerned in it."[3] The earliest Epistle from an American meeting to the Yearly Meeting in London was sent by Burlington Friends in 1681. Friends continued to come to this land of liberty, and various meetings were established. Burlington Quarterly Meeting appears to have been set up in 1680, and in May, 1681, it was concluded to establish a Yearly Meeting to be held in the "sixth month" (August) following. This meeting was held for four days. A meeting was held annually until

[1] Proud's, "Pennsylvania," vol. i., p. 157.
[2] MS. Records, Burlington Monthly Meeting; also Bowden, vol. i., p. 401; A. M. Gummere in "Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography," vol. vii., p. 249; vol. viii., p. 3, etc.
[3] MS. Records, Burlington Monthly Meeting.

1686, after which for a number of years it was held alternately at Burlington and Philadelphia.

The success which Friends had met with in West New Jersey naturally led them to look toward East New Jersey, and in 1681 it was purchased by William Penn and eleven other Friends; these increased the number of proprietors to twenty-four, among whom were included those not members. Several of the new owners were Scotchmen, among them Robert Barclay, the Apologist; he was elected governor of New Jersey, but never went out himself, appointing Thomas Rudyard as his deputy.[1] In 1688 the proprietors surrendered their political rights to the crown.

The earliest Friend in the Carolinas of whom there is any record is Henry Phillips, who lived where Hertford now is, and who was visited by William Edmundson in 1671; he had not seen a Friend for seven years. Edmundson appointed a meeting, which was attended by many people, "but they had little or no religion, for they came and sat down in the meeting smoking their pipes." He made some impression, however, for they wished to have more meetings. A quarterly Meeting for discipline was established, said to be the first religious organization in North Carolina.[2]

George Fox in 1672 was the next visitor, and

[1] Smith, pp. 156, 166; Winsor, vol. iii., pp. 435 ff.; New Jersey Archives, vol. i., pp. 376, 383, 395 ff.; Whitehead, pp. 118 ff.
[2] Edmundson, p. 59 ff.; Bowden, vol. i., pp. 409 ff.

has left a graphic account of his visit.[1] Edmundson went to Carolina again in 1676, and from his account it would seem that Friends were established there.[2] Though some of the inhabitants may have been religious refugees from Virginia, the accounts of Fox and of Edmundson do not convey that impression. The early Quakers in North Carolina appear to have been originally persons without religion, and to have been first converted through the efforts of these missionaries.[3]

Monthly and quarterly meetings were set up probably as early as 1680, and George Fox, writing in 1681, advises the establishment of a Half-Yearly or Yearly Meeting.[4] In 1698 the Yearly Meeting was set up, and from that date to the present has been held regularly. The settlements were at first on or near Albemarle Sound, but as the colony increased in population the Friends spread, not only in the northern part of the province but in the southern, for we find Fox addressing an Epistle to Friends in Charleston, 1683, in answer to one sent by them to him dur-

[1] "Journal," p. 376. [2] Edmundson, pp. 99 ff.

[3] Stephen B. Weeks, "The Religious Development in the Province of North Carolina," "John Hopkins University Studies in History and Political Science," Tenth Series, Baltimore, 1892, pp. 22. ff.

[4] "Epistles." p. 462. Late in 1691 or early in 1692 Thomas Wilson and James Dickinson visited Friends in North Carolina, "who were exceeding glad to see [them], they not having had any visit by a traveling Friend for several years." Wilson also speaks of the wolves roaring "about the houses in the night time." (Wilson, p. 29; Dickinson, p. 53.

ing the previous year.[1] During the seventeenth century there was perfect religious liberty in the Carolinas, and, as in Rhode Island, Friends were very influential. They reached the height of their influence under the administration of John Archdale, himself a Friend. The history of this remarkable man has been too much neglected. He appears to have become a Friend under the preaching of George Fox. He was elected governor by the proprietaries, his declaration being accepted in place of the usual oath, and, coming out to the province, brought order out of the political chaos. Naturally he regarded the scruples of the Friends, and they became members of the Assembly, and held other offices. Though never in the majority, they held the virtual control from 1694 to 1699.

Archdale's scruples as a Friend did not prevent him from requiring strict obedience to the laws. In 1696 the representatives in South Carolina declared that Archdale by "his wisdom, patience, and labor had laid a firm foundation for a glorious superstruction." [2]

The culmination of Quaker influence was reached in Pennsylvania. This colony was an obvious result of Penn's connection with the Jerseys already referred to, where the success of

[1] "Epistles," p. 490.

[2] Weeks, pp. 32 ff.; Bancroft, vol. ii., pp. 11, 12 (last revision); Bowden, vol. i., p. 415. Archdale wrote a description of Carolina, printed in London, 1707. See W. J. Rivers in Winsor, vol. v., pp. 285 ff.

the Quaker colonists must have confirmed in his mind a project of securing for his fellow-believers a safe refuge from persecution. This idea was not original with Penn; Fox had suggested it in 1660.[1]

William Penn joined the Quakers in 1667, and almost at once became one of the most prominent and influential. The story of his life, often told, is outside the limits of this sketch.[2]

As is well known, Penn obtained the grant of Pennsylvania in consideration of a debt due by the crown to his father, the late Admiral Penn,"[3] in the year 1681,[4] and at once made preparations for the establishment of the new colony. No founder of a State ever placed before himself a nobler object than did Penn. He desired "to establish a just and righteous [government] in this province, that others may take example by it.

[1] Bowden, vol. i., pp. 388, 389.

[2] "The Friend," (Phila.), vol. 7, p. 67; "Friends' Review," vol. 1, pp. 33, 34; "Penna. Magazine," vol. 6, p. 313.

[3] See F. D. Stone's admirable "The Founding of Pennsylvania," in Winsor, vol. iii., pp. 469 ff.; Bowden, vol. ii., chapters i.–vi. Janney's "Life of Penn" is still the best; W. H. Dixon's, "William Penn" is by an outsider. John Stoughton, "William Penn," London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1882, also by an outsider, is the best except Janney's. Macaulay's charges in his "History of England" against Penn, still stand in the text. They have been disproved by Janney, Dixon, and Stoughton in their "Lives"; by John Paget in his "Paradoxes and Puzzles," Edinburgh, 1874, and others. The reader is warned against A. C. Buell, "William Penn," N. Y., 1904, a flippant and untrustworthy book.

[4] The name was given by the king in honor of Admiral Penn; William Penn would have called it New Wales, then Sylvania, but without avail; "nor would twenty guineas move the undersecretary to vary the name." ("Letter," "5th of 1st mo., 1681," Janney, p. 165.)

. . . The nations want a precedent. . . . I . . . desire that we may do the thing that is truly wise and just." Again: "There may be room there, though not here, for such an holy experiment."[1] In accord with these fundamental principles, he prepared and published his well-known Frame of Government, an admirable document, of which, though he took counsel of others, he was unquestionably the chief author.[2] In the preface he lays down the maxim: "Any government is free to the people under it, whatever be the frame, where the laws rule and the people are a party to those laws; and more than this is tyranny, oligarchy, or confusion." What he meant was shown by his words in one of his early letters respecting the province: "I propose . . . to leave myself and successors no power of doing mischief, that the will of one man may not hinder the good of an whole country."[3]

In examining the Frame of Government, and particularly Penn's charter, it must be remembered that he could not do exactly as he wished: as in the case of the death penalty, and in his having command of the militia, etc.[4]

In addition to Pennsylvania Penn acquired

[1] Proud, vol. i., p. 169; Janney, p. 175.

[2] Dixon tries to show that he was greatly indebted to Algernon Sidney; but see Janney, p. 193; Stoughton, p. 177; "Penns and Peningtons," p. 333.

[3] Janney, pp. 187, 172; Proud, vol. ii., Appendix II.; Colonial Records, vol. i.; Hazard, "Annals of Pennsylvania," pp. 558 ff.

[4] Sections v., xv. These documents are printed in full in Proud, Hazard's "Annals," and Colonial Records.

from the Duke of York, as a gift, nearly what is now the State of Delaware.[1] the reputation of William Penn attracted a large number of emigrants, not only from Great Britain but from the Continent, where a pamphlet descriptive of the province was circulated. Two emigrant ships sailed from London in the autumn of 1681. The experiences of some of these emigrants on their arrival were remarkable.[2] Penn sent out a deputy-governor, William Markham, in 1681, and went himself in 1682. After a voyage of about two months, during which the smallpox broke out on the ship, the "Welcome" arrived off New Castle October 27th. On the 29th (O. S.) he reached Upland (now Chester) within the bounds of his province. He proceeded at once to organize the government. Philadelphia had been first laid out in August or September, 1682, "and before Penn sailed for England in 1684 had three hundred and fifty-seven houses, many of them three stories high." "In 1685 William Bradford established his printing-press in Philadelphia, the first in the Middle Colonies."[3] Penn found much to do. Among other things he visited Lord Baltimore, in order to settle the boundaries between Pennsylvania and Maryland, but the effort was

[1] Proud, vol. i., p. 202; Colonial Records, vol. i.; Hazard's "Annals," p. 587.

[2] Watson, "Annals of Philadelphia"; Hazard, "Annals," pp. 537, 557.

[3] Stone, p. 493; Proud, vol. i., pp. 233, 241 ff.; vol. ii., Appendix I. (Penn's Concessions).

unsuccessful. Nor were the boundaries agreed upon until the running of Mason and Dixon's Line in 1762.[1] Penn also visited New York, New Jersey, and attended the Yearly Meeting in Maryland. He returned to England in 1684, impelled thereto by matters, personal, affecting his reputation, and others affecting his province and the Society of his adoption. No colony in America had advanced so rapidly; schools and a printing-press had been established, and a population of seven thousand collected in less than three years.

One of the earliest matters to give Penn concern was the just treatment of the Indians; before he went out he had refused a large offer for the exclusive privilege of trading with the Indians, and had sent written instructions to his commissioners regarding the natives, writing also an Epistle to the latter. He cherished hopes of civilizing them and preserving amicable relations with them, and he provided that the differences between them and

[1] The real trouble lay in the ignorance of the English Government of American geography, which gave rise to many conflicting claims in the colonies. Penn was probably right if the spirit of the grants be taken, while Baltimore technically may have had the advantage. The dispute has given rise to attacks on Penn's character, one of the sharpest of which is that by William Hand Browne, in "Maryland," American Commonwealth Series, Boston, Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1884, pp. 137–149; see also N. D. Mereness, "Maryland as a Proprietary Colony," N. Y., 1903, pp. 29–33. Penn's character and his letters and the documents clear him of the aspersions cast upon him. Full references as to the dispute are given by Stone, in Winsor, vol. iii., p. 513; see also Proud, vol. i., pp. 265–284; vol. ii., pp. 206–211. For a recent temperate discussion see C. M. Andrews, "Colonial Self-Government," N. Y., 1904, pp. 169–175.

the settlers should be settled by arbitration. He did not believe that his charter extinguished their rights to the land, but purchased from them the land before occupation.[1]

The exact provisions and circumstances, of the famous treaty at Shackamaxon are somewhat problematical, but there is no doubt that the tradition preserves the spirit of the interview and Penn's high purposes.[2]

The majority of colonists at first were Friends from England and Wales, but there were also a number from Germany, among them some from Kriesheim, Germany, near Worms. According to Sewel these were converted by William Ames, one of the early Quaker missionaries, who visited the Palatinate in 1659. "On the settlement of Pennsylvania in America . . . they unanimously went thither."[3] They settled at a place they called Germantown. Such was the origin of this well-known division of Philadelphia. Among

[1] Proud, vol. i., pp. 211–215, 300; Hazard's "Annals," pp. 519, 532, 581, 595; Bowden, vol. ii., pp. 57 ff. Penn is said to have given in all about £20,000 to the Indians. (Bowden, vol. ii., p. 72.)

[2] Stone, in Winsor, vol. iii., p. 513, and "Pennsylvania Magazine of History," vol. vi., p. 217; Janney, p. 213. The well-known picture of West gives a totally wrong idea of Penn's appearance; far from being a portly, middle-aged man, he was only thirty-eight years old, athletic, active, and graceful. He is said to have worn a sky-blue frock, the insignia of his office, and to have been dressed as other gentlemen of the period, lacking the sword and plumes, which would have been usually worn by persons in such a position.

[3] Sewel, p. 196; Proud, vol. i., p. 219; "Pennsylvania Magazine of History," vol. iv., p. 1.

the Germans was Francis Daniel Pastorius, the hero of Whittier's "Pennsylvania Pilgrim."

It would be interesting to give the history of this experiment in government in Pennsylvania, but the limits of this sketch and its character forbid it. Suffice it to say that though the proprietor and his government were not without great trials and testings, if prosperity, peace with the Indians, and development are any criterion, Penn's experiment must be pronounced a success, at least for the first ten years. Under Penn's deputies and the royal administration there was much political disorder, but in spite of this the colony developed satisfactorily in material prosperity, so that in 1700 it was one of the most prosperous of all the English colonies.

"Our first concern was to keep up and maintain our religious worship," so writes one of Penn's companions on the "Welcome."[1] The meetings were first held in private houses, but meeting-houses were soon built. The first monthly meeting was held "the 9th day of the Eleventh month [January, 1682/83], being the third day of the week, 1682," "and every third meeting shall be the Quarterly Meeting." Within three months nine meetings for worship and three monthly meetings had been set up. There were a few

[1] S. W. Pennypacker, "Settlement of Germantown," Philadelphia, 1899.

[2] Richard Townsend. Proud, vol. i., p. 229; Bowden, vol. ii., p. 17.

Friends in the province before Penn acquired it, and there appears to have been a monthly meeting at Upland (Chester) in 1681.[1]

The Friends of the new colony attended the Yearly Meeting at Burlington, and in 1683 a proposition was made that there should be a Yearly Meeting for Friends of all the North American colonies; but this was not acceptable to the other bodies of Friends, and nothing came of it. Yearly Meetings were held in Philadelphia during 1683 and 1684, and an effort was made, by sending Epistles to "Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, and all thereaway; also the other way to New England and Rhode Island," to induce the distant Friends to send two or three delegates to Philadelphia as a center. Women Friends also held a Yearly Meeting, and sent an Epistle to the Women Friends of England.[2] In 1685 it was concluded that the Yearly Meeting should be held alternately at Burlington and Philadelphia; a Yearly Meeting of ministers was also established. In 1685, 1686, and 1687 Friends attended from Maryland, New York, and Long Island. The large and growing body was not, however, without its troubles, for

[1] Bowden, vol. ii., p. 19; Michener, p. 50. There is an account of these early settlers, some of them claiming to be Friends, in the "Journal" of Jasper Dankers and Peter Sluyter (Long Island Historical Society Publications, vol. i., Brooklyn, 1867). There is no doubt from the description that they were of those who had "run out from the truth," and who gave Fox, Edmundson, and Burnyeat so much concern. This account has been unjustly quoted as a fair description of the Friends of this period (Browne's "Maryland," p. 135.)

[2] "The Friend" (Philadelphia), vol. xviii., p. 134.

in 1691 began the schism of George Keith, which affected not only the religious organization but the political organization as well,[1] helping to deprive Penn for a time of his province.[2] This

[1] C. M. Andrews, "Colonial Self-Government," N. Y., 1904, p. 201.

[2] George Keith was a Scotchman, a man of unusual ability, but ill balanced. He was highly educated, and was brought up as a rigid Presbyterian. How he came to join the Society is not known. He was for about thirty years a stanch upholder of the views of Friends and bore his full share of the "sufferings for the truth." He took an active part with Penn and Barclay in public disputes in defending the doctrines of the Society. Before he went to America he had occasioned some anxiety on account of speculative opinions which he had embraced. In 1687 he ran the dividing line between East and West Jersey, and in 1689 he removed to Philadelphia on his appointment as head-master of the "public school" just started, which still flourishes, the William Penn Charter School. At the end of a year he was released from the position at his own request. His opposition to the Society first made itself openly manifest at this time—why, it is hard to tell, though Gough intimates that disappointment at not being recognized as leader on the death of George Fox (1690) occasioned his defection. He was disowned by the Friends in America, 1692. Appealing to the various meetings in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, he carried his case to the London Yearly Meeting, 1694; after occupying the careful attention of that meeting, and the one in 1695, he was disowned in London also. This action was without precedent, and it is likely that the English Friends only took cognizance of the case because the schism had extended to England. Keith joined the Church of England in 1700, was ordained, and in 1702 was sent to America by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. His mission was not a success so far as converting the Quakers was concerned. After an absence of about two years he returned, was given a living in Sussex, where he died in 1716. He was particularly bitter against his old associate Penn. Croese, book i., p. 150; book ii., p. 164, and Appendix: Sewel, pp. 504, 510, 535, 616, 636, 648, 664; Gough, vol. iii., chaps. vi., viii., xiii.; Dickinson, p. 52; Wilson, p. 32; Bownas, pp. 54 ff.; Bowden, vol. ii., chap. iv.; Smith, "History of Pennsylvania" in Hazard's "Register of Pennsylvania," vol. vi., pp. 242 ff.; Turner, chap. xiv.; Burnet, "History of His Own Time," p. 670, London, Reeves & Turner (1883); Isaac Sharpless, "A Quaker Experiment in Government," Phila., 1898, pp. 71–83; see also "George Keith," Dictionary of National Biography, London and New York, Macmillan & Co., 1892.

schism shook the Society of Friends in the Middle Colonies, and also in England, to its foundations. There was much acrimony exhibited on both sides, but Keith seems to have been violent in his language and overbearing in his manner. To his opponents he certainly appeared to be an "apostate," and it is not unnatural that they should have used strong language. He accused two ministers of teaching that the inward Christ alone was sufficient for salvation; he charged that the discipline was lax; that Friends had departed from their testimony and practice against war; he wished changes made in various ways; and openly in a meeting accused Friends of meeting together "to cloak heresies and deceit." Some of his charges were without foundation, and while there is no doubt that others were true as to individuals and that there was some truth in others, their wholesale character was unjustifiable and the way in which they were preferred altogether out of order. The documents issued officially by the Society in England (see p. 54) and in America show incontestably, that, whatever individuals might say, the Friends in 1693, as a body, were sound on the fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion.[1]

[1] Friends in London put forth a document entitled "The Christian Doctrine and Society of the People called Quakers, cleared, etc.," Sewel, pp. 619–626; "Christian Doctrine, etc.," pp. 6 ff. (in part); Barclay, "Inner Life" (p. 375, note), says that Keith was disowned "for his unbearable temper and carriage." The London Epistle for 1695 speaks of "C. K." as continuing in "the same spirit of discord and opposition." ("Epistles," vol. i.,

Keith's followers set up a new organization, called the "Christian Quakers and Friends," but the organization did not last very long.[1] Keith's connection with political matters must be passed over, as well as the general political matters of the colony. The colony was taken possession of by the crown, mainly on account of the refusal of the Assembly to vote any money for military purposes, though Penn's arrest for treason, and the Keith disorders had their influence in bringing it about. The colony was restored to Penn in 1694. It has been claimed that he did not at that time object to granting money or men for the defense of the frontier, but it appears that he simply said he would transmit to the Assembly "all orders that the crown might issue for the safety and security of the province."[2]

The Society continued to increase in numbers, so that in 1700 there were forty individual meetings or congregations. There were many Welsh

p. 82.) For the account of an eyewitness in London; [John Whiting] "Persecution Expos'd, etc.," London, Assigns of J. Sowle, 1715, p. 231. For a graphic account of a personal dispute with George Keith at Lynn, Mass.; Journal of John Richardson, Philadelphia, Joseph Crukshank, 1783, pp. 103–127.

[1] Keith's followers put forth a statement of their doctrine, "A Confession of Faith, etc." "Given forth from the Yearly Meeting at Burlington, the 7th, 7th moneth, 1692." Printed and sold by William Bradford in Philadelphia, 1693 (2 ed.). This little volume is very rare. There also exists in a contemporary manuscript endorsed "Articles of George Keith for his Proselites to signe before they received admission into his church fellowship." Copies of both are in the Library of Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.

[2] Bowden, vol. ii., p. 134; Janney, chap. xxviii., p. 395; Proud, vol. i., chaps. xi.–xiii.

settlers, who took up land to the north and west of Philadelphia, and a number of meetings were established among them.

Thus the seventeenth century closed with congregations of Friends established in all of the colonies under the English rule, while in Pennsylvania they were the controlling element, and in the Jerseys and Maryland they had much influence in modifying legislation.

CHAPTER IV.

THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

IT will be impracticable to describe in detail the progress of the Society during the eighteenth century, nor is it needful, for there are no essential features of difference in any one part of the country. During the earlier years of the century, Friends, except where the privileges had been obtained, were striving to obtain relief from the imposition of taxes for the support of a state church, from the requirement of taking judicial oaths, and from contributing directly to the support of the army. Their success in these respects in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Maryland, and North Carolina has been already referred to, and, with the exception of military service, most of the privileges sought were acquired. In Pennsylvania, owing to the increase of immigrants belonging to other denominations, to the colonial wars, and to the dissatisfaction of the English Government with the peace principles of the Quakers, the majority of Friends in the Assembly decreased, until in 1756 six Friends vacated their seats in the Assembly, and at the next election others declined to be candidates. From this time onward Friends discouraged members of the Society from holding

any office.[1] But this action did not put an end to their influence and the exact time when the political control of the Quakers ceased in Pennsylvania is hard to determine.

The troubles in 1754 and 1755 led to the establishment in 1756 of the first "Meeting for Sufferings" in America. Its object primarily was to extend relief and assistance to Friends on the frontiers who might suffer from the Indians or other enemies; to represent the Yearly Meeting; and to look out for the interests of the Society, etc., but not to "meddle with matters of faith or discipline."[2]

The Society of Friends continued to grow in the various colonies during the first half of the century, but it is difficult to arrive at a satisfactory estimate of the total number of members. In 1700 the members in England and Wales have

[1] Colonial Records, vol. vii., pp. 82, 84, 86, 292; Archives, vols. v., vi.; Hazard's "Register," vol. v., p. 115; "The Friend" (Philadelphia), vols. xix., xx.; Thomas F. Gordon, "History of Pennsylvania," Philadelphia, Carey, Lea & Carey, 1829, pp. 281, 321 ff., 339 ff.; Bowden, vol. ii., pp. 278 ff.; A. C. Applegarth, in "Johns Hopkins University Studies," vol. x., pp. 427 ff.; Michener, pp. 274, 281; Isaac Sharpless, "Quaker Government in Pennsylvania," Phila. 1900, vol. i., pp. 247–258; "Memoirs of Samuel Fothergill," pp. 240 ff.; Catharine Phillips, pp. 132, 141; Gough, vol. iv., pp. 458 ff. In Sandwich, Mass., Quarterly Meeting Records, "No members of Select Meeting [ministers and elders] to hold public office of honor, profit, or trust," nor members of "Meeting for Sufferings," "8th Mo. 1788." "Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography," vol. x., p. 283.

[2] Michener, pp. 31 ff.; Bowden, vol. ii., p. 283. The New England Meeting appears to have been established 1775. "Book of Discipline," Providence, John Carter, 1785, p. 77; the Baltimore Meeting in 1778, "Discipline," p. 46.

been estimated at about 66,000.[1] The estimates about 1760 of the number of Friends in Pennsylvania and New Jersey would make the number of Friends in America about 50,000, perhaps more.[2] But it is impossible to give accurate data. Bownas, who visited America in 1702, and again in 1726, notices the great increase in numbers during the intervening period, and speaks of several meetings of fifteen hundred people.[3] With the cessation of persecution and the increase of the number of adherents had come laxity in regard to the good order of the Society, and a declension in spiritual life. This was true of England as well. The journals or lives of Bownas,[4] Samuel Fothergill,[5] Catharine (Payton) Phillips,[6] William Reckitt,[7] Mary (Peisley) Neale,[8] John Griffith,[9] and others are full of testimony to this fact in America, and the manuscript records of the various meetings also bear ample evidence to the same effect. The tendency was, as Bownas remarks, to run to form

[1] J. S. Rowntree, p. 73; Barclay, "Inner Life," p. 633.

[2] Sparks's "Franklin," vol. iv., p. 165 (53,000), but this is much exaggerated; Hazard's "Register," vol. v., p. 339 (25,000); Bowden, vol. ii., pp. 245, 376.

[3] "Journal," p. 139.

[4] "Life," p. 139.

[5] "Memoirs of Samuel Fothergill," Liverpool, 1843, pp. 159, 166, 168, 187, 214, 280 (a long account of the meetings in America in 1756).

[6] "Memoir of Catharine Phillips," Philadelphia, 1798, pp. 107, 118, 138.

[7] "Life," London, 1776, pp. 138, 151.

[8] "Life of Samuel and Mary Neale," London, 1845, pp. 335, 342, 353, 356.

[9] "Journal," 1779, pp. 368, 371, 375, 381, 383, 394, 399.

rather than "to abide in the power and life." There was a great increase in the amount of secular business transacted in the meetings for discipline; the dress and manner of life seemed to attract as much if not more attention than the spiritual condition of the church.[1] In 1755, in New England especially, a great awakening took place. All who could not show their right of membership[2] were set aside and were required to make new applications for admission. Queries relative to the state of the church were directed by the Yearly Meetings to be answered, and the replies sent to the Yearly Meeting, and there was a general overhauling of the church-membership. The comparatively informal rules of order soon became a Discipline. This movement extended throughout the Society, and marks the beginning of the rigid rules of order which so long characterized it. As has been well said: "The increased attention to the Discipline, valuable and important as it was, was too often associated with too rigid an adherence to forms, and a tendency to multiply rules, and to make the exact carrying of them out, in a degree at least, a substitute for that patient and discriminating wisdom, tempered with love,

[1] Sandwich Monthly Meeting, MS. Records, "8th Mo. 1751": Savory Clifton, an aged minister, "under dealing for asking an hired minister to pray for Butler Wing's sick family." "1722, 2nd Mo.": "Friends should not wear periwigs." "1761, 4th Mo.": "Gravestones requested to be removed."

[2] The exact time when membership was established in America cannot be stated with accuracy. But see p. 110.

which should ever characterize Christian discipline."[1]

Now began the general expulsion of members for marrying non-members, the severe rules in regard to dress and language, and many of those customs and outward practices which a later generation has supposed were peculiar to Friends from their foundation.

There had been various Rules of Discipline observed in England,[2] but no Book of Discipline, as such, had been adopted by the Yearly Meetings until 1738, when a manuscript Book of Rules was sent down from the Yearly Meeting in London to the quarterly meetings. This consisted of quotations from the minutes of the Yearly Meeting and from "Advices" given forth at various times. The first printed Discipline was published by direction of the London Yearly Meeting of 1782, and published in 1783. The second edition was issued in 1802, and the third in 1834. "A singular air of Secrecy was thrown around the books. No individual Friend was to possess a copy," they were for the exclusive use of Meetings. This edition has been the basis of all subsequent editions and "Disciplines" issued by English Friends.[3]

[1] J. B. Braithwaite, "Memoirs of J. J. Gurney," vol. ii., p. 13.

[2] See "Treatise Concerning Christian Discipline, Compiled with the Advice of a National Meeting of the People called Quakers held in Dublin, in the Year 1746," by John Rutty, M.D. Printed in the year 1752.

[3] Barclay, "Inner Life," p. 527; J. S. Rowntree, "The Friends' Book of Discipline," "Friends' Quarterly Examiner," (1898) vol 33, pp. 459–498; an admirable historical study.

In America the "Canons and Institutions" (p. 52) or a modification of them were in general use, and though there were rules of "good order of truth" adopted by the Virginia Yearly Meeting in 1702, and seventeen "Queries" adopted in 1722, these were not a formal Book of Discipline.[1] Nor is it likely that the references in the Philadelphia Records in 1707 and 1711 refer to anything more.[2] The regular Books of Discipline appear to have been generally adopted about 1759,[3] but they were all in manuscript.[4] With the adoption and strict carrying out of a system of outward rules came an almost total cessation of aggressive efforts to spread the doctrines of the Society, and even of missionary efforts. The visits of ministers from the Old World or from the various parts of America were almost wholly confined to the established congregations, and their service to warning, exhorting or encouraging the members to be faithful to the "testimonies"; not that the gospel was not preached, nor the shortcomings seen,

[1] Virginia MS. Records, "21st to 23d of 7th mo. [Sept] 1722."

[2] Michener, pp. 250 ff.

[3] The Virginia Yearly Meeting adopted a comparatively full Discipline in 1758, which was referred to as a "Book of Discipline" in an Epistle to "the Yearly Meeting for Pennsylvania and New Jersey," dated "the 13th of the 5th mo. to the 15th of the same inclusive, 1758." Baltimore Yearly Meeting adopted a Book of Discipline in 1739 (no Queries); New England either in 1759 or 1760. (Sandwich Monthly Meeting Records, 8th mo. 1760.)

[4] New England Friends revised their Discipline in 1785, compared it with that of London, 1783, and those of the neighboring Yearly Meetings, and printed it 1785. Philadelphia followed in 1797.

but the remedy was thought to be a fuller support of the Discipline. In other words, the "policy was purely defensive; they placed great reliance upon penalties as a means for preventing misconduct, and they endeavored to erect external barriers against the contamination of the world." This policy resulted not only in the retreat "within their own borders, but in their endeavor, painful but fruitless, to isolate themselves from that world which they had hoped to conquer." [1] They were truly philanthropic, and, as will be seen, advocated earnestly the cause of the Indian and the slave. But their spirit in spreading the gospel was widely different from that of their predecessors of the seventeenth century. Never, perhaps, has there been a better example to illustrate the fact that a church which is not aggressive is sure to decline. When the records are examined and the lists of disownments for "marrying out" and for external infractions of the Discipline are read, the wonder is that there was any Society left; well has the period been termed the "middle ages of Quakerism." [2] Not till the nineteenth century was well advanced was there an abatement of this policy. Another serious result must be noticed. There grew up an idea that internal guidance alone was

[1] "Westminster Review," 1852, p. 619, reprinted in "Littell's Living Age," vol. 33, p. 443.

[2] William Thistlethwaite, "Lectures on the Rise and Progress of Friends," London, 1865, pp. 76–111 (especially pp. 91–97).

essential, and this inevitably led to a depreciation of the importance of the Scriptures and of the ministry of the Word. This is shown by the decrease in the number of the ministers and the great increase in the number of the elders and overseers.[1] For fifty years or more after the founding of the Society there was no regular membership; those who attended the meetings and were believed to be converted and to hold the views of the Society were deemed members. Such were invited to sit in the "men's meetings" (meetings for discipline), and also the children of such when old enough and thought suitable.[2] Lists of such persons were made out and kept,[3] and such as behaved disorderly were "denied," or "disowned," that is, expelled. It was not until 1737 that positive legislation on membership was enacted by London Yearly Meeting. The occa-

[1] Elders appear to have been first appointed in England in 1727, and overseers in 1752, and probably about the same time in America. In the early days, elder and minister were often synonymous, and in New England in 1728 an overseer appears to have been equivalent to the modern elder. (See also Rutty's "Discipline," pp. 26 ff.) Though Philadelphia as early as 1714 appointed elders "to sit with the ministering friends," the name appears to have been used in its popular sense. Barclay, "Inner Life," pp. 523, 527; Sandwich Records, "1st Mo. 24, 1728–29"; Michener, pp. 169 ff.) It should be said that persons with some of the duties of overseers were appointed as early as 1668, but the "overseer" as now understood was not appointed until 1752.

[2] "When about twenty years of age I was invited by Friends to be a member of the men's meeting in Cork" (1677). ("Life of Joseph Pike," by John Barclay, London, Darton & Harvey, 1837, p. 39; see also pp. 40, 131; Barclay, "Inner Life," pp. 361 ff.)

[3] Beck and Ball, pp. 253, 254; W. Tanner, "Lectures on the Early History of the Society of Friends in Bristol and Somersetshire," London, A. W. Bennett, 1858, pp. 63 ff.

sion which brought it about was the difficulty in determining who were the "poor," and it was determined that: "All Friends shall be deemed members of the Quarterly, Monthly, and Two-Weeks Meeting within the compass of which they inhabited or dwelt the 1st day of the Fourth Month, 1737"; and "the wife and *children* to be deemed members of the Monthly Meeting of which the husband or father is a member, not only during his life but after his decease."[1] Such is the minute which fixed upon the Society the peculiarity of "Birthright Membership." The vast importance of this step was not appreciated for some time. It changed the Society of Friends from a church of believers, at least in theory, to a corporation or association of persons some of whom always would be of those who were not spiritually minded. Youth had been no hindrance in the early days, provided the person was believed to be spiritually minded; after the adopting of this regulation membership for a large number had no connection with change of heart. Another effect was to lessen the desire to proselytize. It is still an open question with many whether "Birthright Membership" has not been an evil.[2]

[1] Barclay, "Inner Life," p. 520; Rowntree, p. 112. It should be said that Friends from the earliest days have taken care of their own poor.

[2] See "Friends' Quarterly Examiner," London, 4th mo., 1872, p, 349; also R. Barclay, "On Membership in the Society of Friends" (answer to above article), London, Samuel Harris & Co., 1872. Some hold the view that the action of 1737 was sim-

A rule similar to that of London Yearly Meeting seems to have been adopted in America about 1755, when the revival of the Discipline took place.

It remains to notice three important matters: two in which the Friends of the eighteenth century took the deepest interest, and one which was the cause of much suffering—relations to the Indians, relations to slavery, and the American Revolution.

The feelings of George Fox toward the Indians have already been referred to. In his travels he held a number of meetings with them, and after his return from his visit to America wrote to Friends in that country urging them to preach the gospel to the natives.[1] The early missionaries frequently had meetings with the Indians, and the intercourse between the natives and Friends was almost without exception friendly. Penn's treatment of them in the Jerseys and afterward in Pennsylvania is a matter of common history.[2] It

ply a declaration of what had been a custom, but there does not seem to be sufficient evidence for this position. By the "Constitution and Discipline for the American Yearly Meetings of Friends" [Orthodox], 1900, "Associate Membership" is substituted for "Birthright Membership." Part II., chap. II.

[1] "Epistles" pp. 253, 426, 462, 477, 553.

[2] Smith's "New Jersey," pp. 95, 144, 533, etc.; Proud, vol. i., pp. 194, 213, 300; vol. ii., p. 292; A. C. Applegarth, "Johns Hopkins University Studies," vol. x., pp. 450 ff.; Colonial Records, Pa., vols. i., ii., iii.; Winsor, vol. iii., pp. 473, 489; "Historical Magazine," vol. vi., p. 64; "Journal" of John Richardson, Philadelphia, 1783, pp. 123 ff. (an interesting description by a spectator of one of Penn s treaties with the Indians); "Journal" of Joseph Oxley, London, 1837, p. 323.

is stated that from 1733 to 1751 £8366 were expended for the benefit of the Indians in Pennsylvania. Great efforts were made to prevent the sale of liquor to them, and to prevent cheating in trade. "Strict amity between the Indians and the first and early settlers of Pennsylvania and New Jersey and their successors [lasted] for above seventy years."[1] The first serious hostilities were in 1755, and were contemporaneous with the beginning of the retirement of the Friends from active political supremacy. The Friends did not cease their efforts for the amelioration of the natives. They were visited from time to time by traveling Friends,[2] and in 1756 an association was formed for "gaining and preserving peace with the Indians by pacific measures." Friends also believed it right to be present when treaties were being negotiated, to influence right treatment if nothing else. They were charged with abetting the Indian enemies of the province, and greatly slandered.[3] The Meeting for Sufferings in Philadelphia again and again had the condition of the Indians under consideration, it also addressed Epistles to them, and later established schools and missions for them, the first near the New York and Pennsylvania boundary line near the Allegheny River; later still (1803) a mission was established at Tunessasa, which still exists (1905.) The interest

[1] Proud, vol. ii., p. 325.
[2] John Woolman, "Journal," p. 144 (1763).
[3] "The Friend" (Philadelphia), vol. xx., pp. 13 ff.

was not confined to Pennsylvania, but was manifested in Maryland, New York, and New England as well, where committees were appointed and active work done.[1]

The position of the Society as to slavery for a long time was, like that of the other religious bodies of the day, toleration. George Fox first came into contact with slavery in 1671 at Barbadoes, and his heart was stirred up against the sinfulness of the slave-trade and filled with compassion for the slave. He regarded the slave as a man, and plainly told the slaveholders that if they were in the condition of their slaves they would consider it "very great bondage and cruelty." He also urged that negroes should be dealt with "mildly and gently," and after certain years of servitude be set free. His Epistles to America frequently urge upon Friends to preach the gospel to them, coupling them with the Indians.[2] William Edmundson, in 1675, at Barbadoes preached to the negroes, and also told the governor that Christ had died for them as for all men.[3] William Penn in the articles of "The Free Society of Traders" (1682) provided for the freedom of negro slaves after fourteen years' service.[4] But,

[1] For an extended account see "North American Indians and Friends . . . to the year 1843," London, Edward Marsh, 1844; Bowden, vol. ii., chap. iii.; see also the various volumes of "The Friend" (Philadelphia).

[2] "Journal," p. 354; "Epistle" 355 (p. 406); "The Friend" (Philadelphia), vol. xvii., p. 29.

[3] "Journal," pp. 71 ff.

[4] Bowden, vol. ii., p. 190; Watson's "Annals," p. 480; "Pennsylvania Magazine of History," vol. v., p. 45.

like the Friends generally, he seems to have adopted the custom and owned slaves, and, through no fault of his own, died a slaveowner, his purpose and directions to set his slaves free not having been complied with.[1] The negroes were well treated by the Friends, Penn particularly exerting himself on their behalf.[2] But the most decided effort on behalf of the slave was made by the German Friends, already mentioned (p. 93), who at a "meeting at Germantown held the 18th of the Second Month [April], 1688," addressed a protest "against the traffic in the bodies of men," and against handling "men as cattle." To the monthly meeting this was "so weighty" that it was referred to the quarterly meeting, and further referred to the Yearly Meeting the same year, which records: "A paper was presented by some German Friends concerning the lawfulness and unlawfulness of buying and keeping negroes. It was adjudged not to be proper for this meeting to give a positive judgment in the case, it having so general a relation to many other parts; and therefore at present they forbear it." This document is believed to be the first official protest of any religious body against slavery.[3] This action of the

[1] Janney, pp. 435 ff.; Michener, p. 331; Bowden, vol. ii., p. 196. There are reasons for thinking that Penn's secretary took slaves for debt without his knowledge.

[2] Proud, vol. i., p. 423; Michener, p. 336.

[3] Michener, pp. 331 ff.; Bowden, vol. ii., pp. 192 ff. "The Friend" (Philadelphia), vol. xvii., p. 125; "Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography," vol. iv., p. 28, where the document is given in full.

sturdy Germans was not without effect, for in 1693 it was advised that no slaves should be bought "except to set free," and in 1696 the Yearly Meeting advised Friends "not to encourage the bringing in of any more negroes," and also that they should be brought to meetings, and in other respects well cared for. After this, at the instance of Penn himself, laws were passed by the Assembly designed to improve their moral condition; and after he had left, laws were enacted to restrict the importation of slaves into the province, and in 1711 their importation was absolutely prohibited. The law was not, however, acceptable to the Council in England, and it was rejected by that body, as was also another law imposing a prohibitive duty of twenty pounds per head on every slave imported. The Pennsylvania Friends continued to agitate the subject among themselves, but though individuals and different monthly meetings felt strongly, the Yearly Meeting would not commit itself to any positive action. Among those who were earnest in the cause were Ralph Sandiford, who published a treatise against slavery in 1729, the eccentric Benjamin Lay, and Anthony Benezet, who were untiring in their efforts, by their lives, their speech and their pens.

The most noted apostle of freedom to the slave, as well as the most attractive, was John Woolman, whose simple "Journal" has charmed thousands. To his faithful efforts was largely due the action of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting in 1758, which

directed a "visitation" of all who held slaves, and decided that all who should "be concerned in importing, selling, or purchasing slaves" should be forbidden to sit in meetings for discipline. It was not, however, until 1776 that slaveholders were to be "disowned" (expelled) if they refused to manumit their slaves. New England Friends in 1758 and 1769 passed strong "minutes" in regard to slavery, and in 1772 Friends were "disowned" for not setting their slaves free; in 1782 no slaves were known to be held by members of that meeting. In New York it was made in 1776 a disciplinary offense to buy, sell, or hold slaves. In Virginia the steps taken were somewhat similar to those in Pennsylvania, but in 1784 meetings were directed to disown those who refused to manumit their slaves. Baltimore Yearly Meeting took similar action in 1777. "By the close of the eighteenth century there was not a slave in the possession of a Friend in good standing except where slaves were held by trustees, and state laws did not allow them to be set free." The interest in the negroes and in the slaves in the slave States did not diminish, but for the negro, as for the Indian, the Society has retained a deep interest ever since.[1]

[1] Authorities for the foregoing paragraphs: "The Friend" (Philadelphia), vols. xvi., xvii. These articles were afterwards collected and published under the title "Brief Statement of the Rise and Progress of the Testimony of the Religious Society of Friends against Slavery and the Slave Trade, etc." Phila., 1843. Bowden, vol. ii., chap. viii.; "Memoirs of Pennsylvania Historical Society," vol. i., pp. 366 ff.; A. C. Applegarth, "Johns Hopkins University Studies," vol. x., pp. 447 ff.; Clarkson, "His-

As in England so in America, Friends deprecated any appeal to arms for the settlement of difficulties. Reference has been made to this in the case of Pennsylvania in 1755. In 1775 they took the same position. Besides their "testimony against war," they had always upheld the doctrine of submission to the powers that be, where conscience did not forbid. It was therefore fully in accord with practice and principle that Philadelphia Yearly Meeting should do all in its power to prevent its members from countenancing the approaching warlike struggle with England. Addresses were issued to its own members, and to the people at large, setting forth their views.[1] In 1776 representatives from New England, Virginia, and North Carolina attended Philadelphia Yearly Meeting to consult on the course to be pursued.[2] With few exceptions, the members of the Society everywhere did their best to remain neutral, the object being to avoid *all warlike* measures. That they were in sympathy with the desires of the fellow-citizens to obtain redress of grievances is shown by the fact that in one of the non-importation agree-

tory of the Slave Trade"; John G. Whittier, "Introduction to Journal of John Woolman"; Roberts Vaux, "Lives of Sandiford and Lay"; "Journal" of John Woolman; "Journal" of John Churchman; Michener, pp. 328 ff. Allen C. Thomas, "Attitude of the Society of Friends towards Slavery in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," etc. Papers of American Society of Church History, vol. viii, pp. 263–299, New York, 1897. It should be said that to the self-denying labor of John Woolman, who visited Friends throughout America, is due more than to any other man, the action of Friends toward slavery.

[1] Bowden, vol. ii., pp. 298–306. [2] Bowden, vol. ii., p. 307.

ments of 1765 fifty of the signers were Friends. But it was natural that their testimonies and addresses against war and their peaceable habits during times of great excitement should cause suspicion, and that many should misunderstand their position. It is also altogether likely that a considerable number of the Society, particularly in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, really disapproved of severing the bonds uniting the colonies with the mother-country. In consequence of these circumstances the sufferings of the Friends were great, especially so in Pennsylvania, where they might have expected more consideration. Refusing to serve in the army, their property was seized to pay for substitutes; refusing to pay taxes levied especially for warlike purposes, again their property was seized. In 1779 or thereabouts the Assembly enacted a law requiring a test oath of all who taught school, which virtually shut out Friends from educating their own children, and their remonstrances had little effect. But the most aggravated case was the arrest and banishment to Winchester, Virginia, of twenty prominent citizens of Philadelphia, seventeen of whom were Friends, without trial, on false charges, as they and their friends insisted at the time, and as was afterward proved.[1]

To a greater or less extent the experiences of the

[1] Friends still, in spite of the overwhelming proof to the contrary, suffer from these unjust charges. See Winsor, vol. vi., pp. 393, 417; Hildreth's "United States," vol. iii., p. 195.

Friends in Pennsylvania was that of those in the other States. In New England some supported the Revolution actively, justifying a defensive war, and in Philadelphia there were many disownments, and also a small separation on the same account in 1781, where the separatists were known as the "Free" or "Fighting Quakers."[1]

At the conclusion of the war relief came, and Friends loyally supported the new government.[2] Soon after the inauguration of Washington the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting sent him an address expressive of good wishes for the success of his administration, to which he replied in a pleasant and cordial manner.[3]

[1] A meeting-house was built for them at Fifth and Arch streets, by "general subscription," in 1783, or, as the inscription on the building, which is still standing, says, "Erected A.D. 1783, of the empire 8." The house is now occupied by a business firm. See Charles Wetherill, "History of the Free Quakers," Philadelphia, 1894 (not published).

[2] See for the foregoing paragraphs, Bowden, vol. ii., chaps. xii., xiii.; Michener, chap. xxxii.; "Exiles in Virginia"; William Gordon, "American Revolution," vol. iv., p. 377: "The Friend" (Philadelphia), vols, xix., xx.; New York Historical Society, "Collections," 1876–78; "Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography," vols. i., ix., xvi., etc.; Howard M. Jenkins, "Historical Collections of Gwynedd" (Philadelphia, 1884), p. 311, note.

[3] J. Sparks, "Writings of Washington, xii., 168;" Old South Leaflets, No. 65.

CHAPTER V.

DIVISIONS DURING THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

[It should be remembered that the titles in this chapter are used simply for the purpose of distinction, and are those which are employed in the United States Census of 1890. As all divisions claim the name of Friends, some course like this is necessary.]

AMONG the incidents of the early years of the nineteenth century was the case of Hannah Barnard. This Friend, a minister of New York Yearly Meeting, duly accredited with certificates from her home meetings, visited the Friends of Great Britain and Ireland in 1798–1801. She travelled extensively in Ireland, and appears to have promulgated doctrines closely allied to rationalistic. She also greatly aided the serious defection which occurred among the Irish Friends, 1798–1803.[1]

She attended London Yearly Meeting in 1800, where she was the cause of much uneasiness to Friends. She applied to the Morning Meeting (Meeting of Ministers and Elders) for a certificate to visit the continent of Europe. Objections were

[1] [William Rathbone], "Narrative of Events in Ireland." London, 1804. This book is wholly given up to the history of the separation in Ireland.

raised on the ground of "unsoundness" of doctrine. Her case was referred to Devonshire House Monthly Meeting, within which she was considered technically resident. This meeting advised her to desist from preaching and return home. This she declined to do, and appealed to the Quarterly Meeting from the "censure and restraint" of the Monthly Meeting. The Quarterly Meeting confirmed the judgment of the lower meeting as did also the Yearly Meeting to which she further appealed.

Hannah Barnard returned to America in 1801, declining to accept any pecuniary assistance toward the expense of her homeward journey.[1] Her case was taken up in her own meetings and she was disowned (expelled) in 1802. There seems to have been on both sides a great lack of the spirit of condescension and love.[2]

During the latter years of the eighteenth and the earlier years of the nineteenth century the attention of Friends had been more engrossed with the enforcement of the Discipline, the carrying out of certain moral reforms, and with philanthrophy,[3] than with questions of doctrine or with

[1] It was usual for the English Meeting to pay the homeward passage of visiting ministers.

[2] For a full account of Hannah Barnard's case, see "The Yorkshireman," Pontefract, 1837, vol. v., pp. 17–31, 60–64, 70–77; Janney, vol. iv. pp. 7–34, 93–96; [Rathbone] "Narrative" as above, pp. 106–109; see also Bibliography at the end of this volume.

[3] Some idea of the members and wealth of the American Friends at this time can be gained from the fact that in 1801–02 the American Yearly Meetings sent to London Yearly Meeting

evangelization. The elders and overseers gradually exercised more and more authority, till they, with a few of the more weighty members, virtually controlled the Society.

In a general way the reading of the Scriptures was encouraged, but it was before the time of low-priced Bibles, and quite a number of families did not own a copy, while others had but a portion of the book.[1] Some Friends only read it when inwardly moved to do so; and some objected to "fixing times" for reading, as being a lifeless form.[2] The lack of biblical knowledge which naturally resulted from this was not supplied by any definite teaching. Bible-schools were not yet known, and the task of instructing the children was left almost entirely to the parents, who too often did not attend to the duty, partly from the fear of interfering with the work of the Spirit in the hearts of their children.[3]

The ministry was largely hortatory, and many

"for the relief of their brethren in distress through the scarcity of provisions" £8285. 0. 8. Of this sum Pennsylvania sent £5798. 15. 7; New York £1375. 4. 1; New England £928. 26; Maryland £182. 18. 6. "The Yorkshireman," 1837, vol. v. pp. 34, 35.

[1] In a circular issued by the Bible Association of Friends, an association founded by the Orthodox body after the separation, it was stated that in 1832 four hundred families were without a complete copy of the Scriptures, while one hundred and thirty-eight had not even a New Testament. If this was the case with the body that laid the greater stress on the importance of the Bible, the condition of affairs in the other branch may be imagined. See "The Friend" (Philadelphia) vol. ii.; pp. 413 ff; vol. v., pp. 268–270.

[2] This was the view of Elias Hicks. (See Foster's "Report," vol. ii., pp. 420, 421.)

[3] "Memoir of Rachel Hicks," p. 34.

meetings were held in absolute silence. While there is abundant evidence that there were among the Friends during the whole of this period able ministers and experienced Christians who were careful of the younger members, nevertheless the condition of spiritual life throughout the body was low, and a large proportion were Friends rather by tradition than conviction, and many were careless and some unbelieving.[1] The soil was therefore prepared for the introduction of almost any new opinions that might be plausibly presented.

The Separation of 1827–28.

[The literature on the Separation of 1828 is voluminous, but most of it is strongly partizan. For this reason chief recourse has been had to Foster's Report of the New Jersey Trial, where statements respecting facts and doctrine were made under affirmation. The following, however, may be mentioned as authorities on each side : *Hicksite*, Elias Hicks, "Journal," New York, 1832 ; "The Berean," Wilmington, Del., 1825 ; "The Friend or Advocate of Truth," Philadelphia, 1828–30, 3 vols. ; Journal of John Comly ; "The Quaker," 4 vols., Philadelphia, 1827–28 ; *Orthodox*, "The Friend," Philadelphia, vols. 2–4, 1827–32 ; "Miscellaneous Repository," Mt. Pleasant, O., vols. 1–4, 1827–32, Journal of Thomas Shillitoe, London, 1839, vol. 2.]

THE separation of 1827–28 sharply divides the earlier history of Friends from the later. The Society, which had till now presented an almost unbroken front, was to be rent into two parts, each sufficiently large to maintain a separate existence, and each claiming to be the original body.

[1] The Journals of travelling Friends testify to this ; see "Life of Stephen Grellet," London, 1860, vol. i., p. 97, 160, 161.

The most prominent person connected with the separation of 1827–28 was Elias Hicks, an eloquent and popular minister of Long Island, N. Y.[1] He was a man of powerful build, commanding person, and indomitable will. He had only an elementary education. His mind was strong, logical, intense, and practical, rather than broad or deep. His personal influence was great and lasting, and where he labored most his following was greatest.

As his teachings became the subject of much controversy, it is necessary to go into them rather fully, in order that the reader may understand the ground taken by those who objected to him. It must be clearly understood, however, that that body of Friends generally called by his name has never formally accepted his doctrine, and many of its members hold very different views.[2]

[1] He was born in Hempstead Township, Long Island, N. Y., in 1748. His father joined the Friends soon after the birth of this son, and it is probable that Elias Hicks was received into membership about that time. He traveled much as a preacher, his last journey being when he was eighty years of age. He died in 1830. (See "Journal.") For an able presentation of the man, see Walt Whitman, "Prose Works," Phila., 1892, pp. 455–476.

[2] Writers of all parties agree that for a number of years, there was little that was radical in his teachings. Stephen Grellet, however, as early as 1808, "labored with him [Hicks]" because he "advanced sentiments repugnant to the Christian faith, tending to lessen the authority of the Holy Scriptures, to undervalue the sacred offices of our holy and blessed Redeemer, and to promote a disregard for the right observance of the first day of the week." Life of Stephen Grellet, London, 1860, vol. i., p. 142. Hodgson, vol. i., pp. ff. The controversy arose in the latter part of his life.

There were two sides to his teaching: the practical, which for many years formed the greater part of his preaching; and the speculative. He was an ascetic, condemning all amusements, as such, saying that even to put on a ribbon to gratify one's self was to worship it rather than the Almighty.[1]

His central position was that "God is a Spirit," that a manifestation of his Spirit is given to every man everywhere, and that this alone, if followed and obeyed, is sufficient for his salvation. This thought so possessed his mind that he came to think that everything outward was not only non-essential, but carnal. He went to the logical extent of the theory, and held that the coming and work of Christ Jesus in the flesh, the Scriptures, and all outward teaching were to be classed among the outward things and therefore in no sense essential. The "Light within" was, he taught, the only light that any one need follow.[2] The Scriptures can do no more than direct to this inward principle, and when they have done this

[1] "Philadelphia Sermons," p. 133. Over a thousand printed pages of his sermons were taken down stenographically and printed by M. T. C. Gould, but they all belong to the period of the controversy. While Hicks at first refused to assume any responsibilty for these ("Philadelphia Sermons," Advertisement, p. 4), he afterward expressed general satisfaction with them ("The Quaker," vol. iv., p. vii.), and near the close of his life writes that "in them all objections are answered in regard to my belief and doctrine." ("Six Queries, etc., to Elias Hicks, etc., with Elias Hicks's Answers." See Foster's "Report," vol. ii., p. 434.)

[2] "Philadelphia Sermons," pp. 80–82.

they have finished their work.[1] He taught that they were the best of all books, and had been given by inspiration, and were only to be understood by inspiration, but that without this in the minds of the readers they were not only external, but had been productive of "fourfold more harm than good."[2] "The gospels contain a history, a great portion of which may be true."[3]

The central cause of the controversy was his teachings as to the person and work of Jesus Christ. He taught that Jesus was superior to the rest of mankind because he had a greater work to perform, just as a man with five talents needs greater power than he who has but one.[4] Beyond this he taught that God placed Jesus on an equality with man. In his scheme Jesus was a man liable to sin, yet free from it on account of his obedience, so that at the time of his baptism in the Jordan he be-

[1] See Elias Hicks's "Answer to Six Queries," Foster's "Report," vol. ii., p. 432.

[2] "E. H. to Phebe Willis, 19th of 5th mo. 1818." (Foster's "Report," vol. ii., p. 417.) In a letter to the same individual, "23rd Ninth mo. 1820" (*Ibid.*, vol. ii., p. 420), he writes as follows: "But I may Add that I sometimes think that if they [the Scriptures] are really needful and useful to a few who make a right use of them, yet as I believe they are doing great harm to multitudes of others, whether it would not be better for the few who find Some comfort and help from them to give them up for a time until the wrong use and abuse of them are done away. . . . It would be a very easy thing for divine Wisdom and Goodness to raise up and qualify some of his faithful Servants to write scriptures if he should think best. as good and as competent for the generation in which they lived, and likely would be much better, than those wrote so many hundred years since," etc.

[3] "Philadelphia Sermons," p. 315.

[4] "Answers to Six Queries," etc., Foster's "Report," vol. ii., p. 433; "Philadelphia Sermons," pp. 10, 11, 292.

came the Son of God, going through an experience in this respect that all of us must go through.[1] In his view, Jesus Christ died because he was killed by wicked men, just as any other prophet was martyred. While Hicks taught that his willingness to suffer was a pattern for us, he denied that the Father had sent the Son into the world to suffer, and he maintained that when the trial came Jesus had no alternative, he must be faithful and suffer, or lose his standing with the Father and not be saved with God's salvation.[2] That the death of Christ is of any value to us beyond the example of it, Hicks denied.[3]

It must, however, be borne in mind that Elias Hicks was not simply iconoclastic in his teachings. He believed that men are saved by the power of God, and he held that what he was presenting was the simple spiritual gospel, freed from all the man-made additions and externalities. He himself states emphatically that he had experienced the power of what he was preaching about. There is a passage of much beauty in his journal in

[1] "New York Sermons." p. 96 ; "Philadelphia Sermons," pp. 69, 70, 162. [2] "The Quaker," vol. i., p. 16.

[3] Foster's "Report," vol. ii., p. 424. As there are frequent references in his writings to Christ as the Saviour, the following passage from his "Journal" will explain what he means by the term : "Therefore all the varied names given in Scripture to this divine light and life, such as Emmanuel, Jesus, sent of God, Great Prophet, Christ our Lord, Grace, Unction, Anointed, etc., mean one and the same thing ; and are nothing less nor more than the spirit and power of God in the soul of man, as his Creator, Preserver, Condemner, Redeemer, Saviour, Sanctifier, and Justifier." (Journal," p. 330.)

which he describes the kind of Saviour that man needs: one who is all the time with him to save him at the moment help is needed.[1] He seems to have thought that in order to emphasize the inward it was necessary to deny the outward. He distinctly admits differing from the first preachers in the Society of Friends on the subject of the atonement, maintaining that the light was not clear in their day on this subject, and they were not therefore to blame for not holding the broad views he thought were the true ones.[2]

The Orthodox Party.

Previous to the troubles that immediately preceded the separation, circumstances both in England and America had contributed to turn the attention of Friends particularly to the consideration of their position on the work and person of Jesus Christ. In the early years of this century the rise of the "New Lights" in New England drew away a number from the Society. They openly denied the divinity of Christ, and held not a few extravagant notions, which resulted in very disorderly proceedings, especially in Massachusetts. They were finally after much trouble got rid of, and they came to nothing as an organization, having no element of cohesion.[3]

[1] "Journal," p. 304.
[2] "Letter to Phebe Willis, Ninth mo. 1820," Foster's "Report," vol. ii., p. 421.
[3] Hodgson, "History," vol. i., pp. 58 ff.

These events helped to arouse those who held or were inclined to, Evangelical views, to a sense of danger, and to the necessity of being increasingly careful in their statements and teaching to emphasize what they felt some had forgotten. With some slight difference of opinion they held to the simple statements in the Gospels concerning the miraculous birth of Jesus Christ and to his essential oneness with the Father and with the Holy Spirit, though they preferred not to use the word Trinity, as being non-Scriptural. While not calling the Bible the "Word of God," which name they reserved for Christ, they firmly believed in its inspiration. While the Spirit was primary, they maintained that the Scriptures bore testimony to the Spirit and the Spirit to the Scriptures, so that to be completely furnished both are needed. They held that the sacrifice of Jesus Christ on the cross was necessary for the sins of the whole world, and that through this sacrifice the gift of the Spirit is given to every man that cometh into the world. They believed that the light of Christ shone into the hearts of all, and that every one would be judged according to the light given to him.[1]

The high esteem in which Elias Hicks was everywhere held made opposition to him difficult, and

[1] The views here given are understood by writers generally to have been held by the Orthodox party, so it has not been considered necessary to occupy space with references. Janney, however, is mistaken in thinking that they held extreme views on the atonement, or that those who afterward opposed Joseph John Gurney were inconsistent in not having indorsed Elias Hicks.

people were slow to believe that there could be any unsoundness in his ministry; but gradually the opposition grew. One reason for its slow development was that his discourses were generally on moral themes. He also used many of the familiar phrases common at that time among Friends, and would teach what the Orthodox considered unsound in a few sentences only. His opposers afterward complained that in this way he misled many, who accepted his views unconsciously. They also accused him and his sympathizers of using expressions which sounded correct but which were capable of other meanings.[1]

The Orthodox party found able supporters in English ministers, who about this time traveled extensively among Friends in America. The influence of these ministers was great. It is not unlikely that in their earnestness of purpose they were not always wise, and they doubtless aroused opposition in some cases, where a more conciliatory method would have had better results. Thomas Shilletoe, William Forster, Elizabeth Robson, and Anna Braithwaite were among the most prominent.

[1] John Comly, a leader among the "Hicksites" in Pennsylvania, relates the following of himself. A Methodist minister asked him if he believed that Christ was the son of Joseph or the son of God; he answered, "The latter, undoubtedly," and also assented to the question as to whether we have access to God by his blood. The minister was satisfied, but John Comly adds "Whatever external or material ideas he attached to the terms of his question, the answers were given with reference to the spirituality of Christ," etc. ("Journal" of John Comly, p. 350.)

The trouble began in Philadelphia, and the separations elsewhere were due to it. There was on both sides an exceedingly strong admixture of personal feeling all through the struggle, which, however much it may be regretted, must always be borne in mind. The first open conflict of importance took place during the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of 1823. This was occasioned by the question of sanctioning a document prepared with reference to a newspaper controversy, in which a statement of certain doctrines of the Society was involved.[1]

But the pivot of the whole movement was the clash between Elias Hicks and the Philadelphia elders. The latter were induced, by letters from New York, and also by statements of those who had heard him preach within the limits of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, where he was traveling with due credentials from his own meeting, to seek a private interview with him in relation to his reported unsoundness. To such an interview he finally acceded. But on meeting him they found a number of his friends present. This was

[1] The publication was entitled "Letters of Paul and Amicus," first appearing in a Wilmington (Del.) newspaper, afterward published in book form. The document was prepared by the "Meeting for Sufferings," and consisted chiefly of extracts from standard writings of Friends. It was distinctly Orthodox, and was objected to for doctrinal reasons, and for being in the nature of a creed. The opposition was so great that it was not adopted. The Orthodox Yearly Meeting afterward issued it. (Hodgson, vol. i., p. 134 ff.) For document, see also "The Friend" (Philadelphia, vol. i., pp. 237–239; "Miscellaneous Repository" vol. i., 260–272.

not what they thought had been agreed upon, and so they withdrew. A correspondence followed, in which Elias Hicks did not satisfy the elders. It was held on the one hand that a minister traveling with the proper credentials was bound to be accepted so long as he committed no disciplinary offense ; while on the other hand the elders claimed that their action was in reference to doctrines preached since his leaving home. Hicks, meanwhile, finished his work in Philadelphia and returned to New York, with a written indorsement given him by one of the monthly meetings. So great was the feeling aroused that this latter meeting took steps to remove its elders on the ground that they had unjustly spoken against an "approved minister"; while one of the quarterly meetings took measures to replace its representation in the Meeting for Sufferings by those who sympathized with Hicks. Both these measures were extra-disciplinary and without precedent, the latter being contrary to a recent action of the Yearly Meeting.

There were charges and counter-charges of infractions of the Discipline, so that party spirit ran high on both sides, and the real question at issue was obscured. One reason for the strong feeling which prevailed was that the Hicks party did not appreciate how deeply the Orthodox party felt in regard to anything which in their view tended to lessen the work of Christ. Doctrines, which to the "Hicksites" were unimportant, to the Orthodox

were essential. The former did not object to individuals holding them, but to insist on them as essential they could not understand. The result of this was that the opposition to Hicks was regarded as personal, as arising from unworthy motives, and as persecution. On the other hand, the Orthodox seem to have been unable to understand the motives of their opponents, and would show them no leniency. With such feelings between the leaders of the two sides, separation was inevitable. The Orthodox appear to have utterly failed to grasp the tendency of the times. The great movements in the direction of political and intellectual liberty that arose toward the close of the eighteenth century were having their effect upon the Friends. There was a spirit that rebelled against the authority of the elders, and proclaimed that the true principle of Friends was democratic.[1] Elias Hicks undoubtedly appealed to this element.

John Comly, of Byberry, Pennsylvania, appears to have been the first to decide that the trying condition of affairs could have no outcome but separation. As the Yearly Meeting of 1827 drew on, he traveled in different parts of the territory of the

[1] Up to this time copies of the Philadelphia Discipline were almost exclusively in charge of the "overseers and clerks," and, in the words of a member in 1825, they were "kept as secret and as sacred the books of the Hindoos." (Preface to privately printed copy of Discipline, Philadelphia, 1825.) This was not peculiar to Philadelphia; London Yearly Meeting did not allow individuals to have copies of the first edition of its Discipline. J. S. Rowntree, Friends' Quarterly Examiner, 1898 (vol. xxxii.) pp. 469, 470.

Yearly Meeting[1] and held conferences with those like-minded with himself, but found comparatively few ready for such a move. So it was determined to make one more effort to gain control. There seems to have been no thought of compromise on either side. The first thing was to secure the appointment of a clerk to the Yearly Meeting who would be favorable,[2] the present clerk being strongly Orthodox. The three quarterly meetings which sympathized with Hicks sent up decidedly more representatives than customary, in two cases double the usual number.[3] The representatives, on whom devolve the responsibility of nominating clerks, met, and had such a long and stormy session that the meeting at large reassembled before they had come to a conclusion. This, according to custom, resulted in the officers of the previous year retaining their places: they were Samuel Bettle, clerk, and John Comly, assistant. As the latter was privately arranging for a division of the body, he strongly objected, but was prevailed upon to act. The next morning he again objected, on the ground that there were two irreconcilable parties in the meeting, and proposed adjournment. No date being mentioned, this proposition was taken by many as meaning that the Yearly Meeting should be dissolved, so the proposition was not accepted.

[1] "Journal," pp. 311 ff.
[2] See chapter on Organization, p. 13.
[3] Foster's "Report," vol. i., p. 332.

It is needless to describe the sessions of that year. The sympathizers with Hicks were holding all the time private meetings perfecting plans for making "a quiet retreat from the scene of confusion," and at the same time taking part in the business of the meeting. Near the close of the sessions a proposition came in from the Women's Meeting to have a committee appointed to attend all the lower meetings with authority to assist and help them. This was being strongly opposed by the "Hicksites" and some of the Orthodox, when a young man arose, and stated that he had attended the previous evening a meeting held by the sympathizers with Hicks, in which plans for a separation were being perfected. The information was so unexpected that some, as his report was not absolutely accurate, denied it. Others acknowledged it, and the committee was appointed.[1]

John Comly and his Friends held a conference after the Yearly Meeting had adjourned, and issued an address in which they stated that the fundamental position of Friends is that "GOD ALONE IS THE SOVEREIGN LORD OF CONSCIENCE, and that with this unalienable right, no power, civil or ecclesiastical, should ever interfere." They pro-

[1] The last act of the united meeting was to agree to send money to North Carolina Friends to assist them to remove some free negroes out of the State who were in danger of losing their liberty. The quarterly meetings afterward contributed their various quotas through the regular treasurer, and this, in connection with the fact that the Yearly Meeting had been allowed to adjourn as usual, was held by the courts as evidence against the claim that the Yearly Meeting had been dissolved.

ceed to say that they feel bound to preserve it "unfettered by the hand of man, and unalloyed with prescribed modes of faith, framed in the will and wisdom of the creature." They then explain how the unity of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting has been interrupted, "that a division exists among us, developing in its progress views which appear incompatible with each other, and feelings averse to a reconciliation. Doctrines held by one part of Society, and which we believe to be sound and edifying, are pronounced by the other part to be unsound and spurious. From this has resulted a state of things that has proved destructive of peace and tranquillity. . . . Measures have been pursued which we deem oppressive, and in their nature and tendency calculated to undermine and destroy those benefits, to establish and perpetuate which, should be the purpose of every religious association."[1] Later on in the address they say: "We feel bound to express to you . . . that the period has fully come in which we ought to look towards making a quiet retreat from this scene of confusion." At the same time they seem to anticipate a time when peace might be restored, and they say that they have no new doctrine nor gospel nor discipline to propose.

The Orthodox were not slow to make use of this address. They pointed out that in it feelings

[1] Address "To Friends within the Compass of the Yearly Meeting held in Philadelphia." (Foster's "Report," vol. ii., pp. 453, 454.)

averse to a reconciliation were acknowledged; and that the Orthodox claim, that the troubles were caused by doctrines which the sympathizers with Hicks considered sound and the Orthodox did not, was distinctly admitted as the primary cause of the confusion. There was no complaint against the doctrines preached by the Orthodox.

Later, the claim was put forward that the proceedings of the Orthodox in controlling the Yearly Meeting had virtually dissolved it and had reduced it to its original elements, so that a reorganization was necessary. At the time, however, it is clear that the sympathizers with Hicks regarded themselves as Separatists.[1]

In June the "Hicksites" called another confer-

[1] Some months later, one of their prominent members, Halliday Jackson, writes: "We could never have calculated on such progress as has been made in so short a time." He says that by the autumn five of the eleven quarterly meetings had sent representatives, and that others had joined and that by spring all would have done so, though he admits that in all of them there were divisions of the meetings that would "adhere to the old establishment." His calculation that four fifths of the membership would declare for his party was far too large, but there is no doubt that they had the decided majority, and it was on this, and on their freedom from doctrinal restraints, that they founded their claim to be the Yearly Meeting of Philadelphia, and called the members of the "old establishment" separatists. (Foster's "Report," vol. ii., pp. 474, 475.)

The numbers actually claimed by the "Hicksites" were 18,485, while they credited the Orthodox with 7344, and put down 429 as undecided. The Orthodox disputed these figures, and claimed that there were not that number of Friends in the Yearly Meeting. Still, they admitted that the majority were with the "Hicksite" body. See Foster's "Report," vol. ii., pp. 461, 495; for "Hicksite" testimony on the point, see vol. ii., p. 176; for the Orthodox, see vol. ii., pp. 388, 399.)

ence and issued another address,[1] in which they say, "To us there now appears no way to regain the harmony and tranquillity of the body, but by withdrawing ourselves—not from the Society of Friends, nor from the exercise of its salutary discipline—but from religious communion with those who have introduced, and seem disposed to continue, such disorders amongst us." They also propose to hold a "Yearly Meeting for Friends in unity with us, residing within the limits of those Quarterly Meetings heretofore represented in the Yearly Meeting held in Philadelphia." The call invited the monthly and quarterly meetings to send representatives to meet in Philadelphia in October, "in company with other members favorable to our views, there to hold a Yearly Meeting of men and women Friends, upon the principles of the early professors of our name," etc. The partisan character of this call which practically excluded a large part of the membership, and the invitation to the monthly meetings to send representatives, which was undisciplinary, were further reasons given by the court in New Jersey for its decision in favor of the Orthodox party, who had continued without interruption to carry on their Yearly Meeting.[2] The proposed

[1] Foster's "Report," vol. ii., p. 455.

[2] The "Hicksite" side is fully stated by Janney in vol. iv. of his "History," and the Orthodox by Hodgson in vol. i. of his "History." The position taken on the legal question in the present sketch is that of Judge Ewing in his "Decision," Report of the Trenton Trial, pp. 1–27.

meeting was held and largely attended, and it was decided to meet thereafter in the spring just before the Orthodox Yearly Meeting. This Yearly Meeting, in October, was noteworthy in that it was attended by Elias Hicks, and that it had a direct bearing on the separation that followed in New York.

Immediately after the undivided Yearly Meeting had closed in the spring of 1827, both parties commenced active operations, and in most of the quarterly meetings scenes more or less disorderly were enacted. The Orthodox, armed with authority from the Yearly Meeting, were firm and unyielding in their demand that all who had, as they said, separated from the body should be excluded from attending the meetings for business, and by this course greatly increased the number of the opposing party. There were painful scenes also in connection with the possession of the meeting-houses. Officially, the "Hicksites" had taken and continued to take a very moderate position as to the property, advising their adherents to suffer wrong rather than disturb the peace.[1] This advice was not, however, followed, and although it is probable that the disorders were committed by younger members, who were simply members by birthright, the Orthodox maintained that the older members also were at fault. The "Hicksites" early in the struggle offered to com-

[1] See "Green St. Meeting Address, Sixth mo. 1827, 10th mo. 1827." (Foster's "Report," vol. ii., pp. 457, 458.)

promise the question of property on the basis of numbers.[1]

The reason the Orthodox gave for the ground they took was that they regarded themselves as trustees for the property that had been placed in the hands of Friends for specific purposes, and that they were bound to see that those purposes were carried out; that the question of numbers was not in the case, and that they could not divide property so that part of it would go for the support of doctrines they considered contrary to the fundamental position of Friends.[2] The feeling was strongest in Philadelphia. In other places where separations occurred there was much less, and in New York and Baltimore the Orthodox have accepted propositions to divide the Yearly Meetings' property on the basis of numbers at the time of the separation, in each case the "Hicksites" paying over to the Orthodox the amount agreed upon by both as being fair.

In the succeeding New York Yearly Meeting, in the early summer of 1828, the presence of some of the members of the "Hicksite" body from Phil-

[1] The position taken by the Orthodox has been attacked sharply in "Divisions in the Society of Friends," Thomas H. Speakman, Philadelphia, 1893, second edition enlarged. For accounts of disorderly proceedings in regard to meeting-houses, etc., see "The Friend," Philadelphia, vol. i., pp. 15, 21, 28, 47, 61, etc.; also "Miscellaneous Repository," vols. 1–4; "Trial of Friends in Philadelphia, June 1828," etc., Philadelphia, 1828.

[2] "An Appeal to the Legislative Council, etc., of New Jersey, on Behalf of the Religious Society of Friends. Signed on Behalf of the Representatives, etc., Jonathan Evans, Clerk." Philadelphia, printed by Joseph Rakestraw, 1836.

adelphia precipitated a separation which appears to have been a foregone conclusion. The Orthodox refused to proceed with the business while those they considered "disowned" members were allowed to remain. Not being able to accomplish their wish, they with the clerk withdrew; but not until considerable disorder had occurred was the separation completed.[1] They pursued the same policy, however, as was followed by the Orthodox in Philadelphia, and disowned all the "Hicksite" adherents. Here the proportion of the membership was about two to one in favor of the "Hicksites." A separation followed in Ohio, which was the most disorderly of any. The "Hicksites" and Orthodox were about equally divided, the former being most to blame for the disorder.[2] A few in Indiana sided with Hicks, but separated very quietly and not during the time of the Yearly Meeting. In Baltimore Yearly Meeting at least four fifths of the membership went with the "Hicksites." The few Orthodox waited in the meeting till the adjournment of the session that had so decided, and then organized.[3] Though the feeling between the bodies in the last two localities was not so great as elsewhere, the Orthodox rigidly disowned each one of the "Hicksites." This was to vindicate their claim to be the only true body of Friends. Be-

[1] "The Friend" (Philadelphia) vol. i., pp. 263–290, etc.

[2] E. Bates, "Miscellaneous Repository, Mount Pleasant, O., 1827–29, vols, 1 and 2."

[3] "Miscellaneous Repository," vol. ii., pp. 59–62, etc. "The Friend" (Philadelphia), vol. 2, pp. 31–69.

sides this, the disciplinary idea was very strong in those days. The "Hicksites" pursued a milder course. The consequence was that many of the undecided found themselves with the "Hicksites," especially when these were in the majority, for the wholesale cutting off of members could not be done with entire judgment.

It will be seen that except in Indiana and Ohio the "Hicksites" had a strong majority in each of the five Yearly Meetings where a separarion occurred. Nevertheless, taking the Society at large, they were in the decided minority, for there was no attempt to divide the Yearly Meetings in the limits of New England, Virginia, or North Carolina, and each of these, with the Yearly Meetings of London and of Dublin, declared in favor of the Orthodox bodies. There was, therefore, no Yearly Meeting that as a whole sided with the "Hicksites," a point on which the Orthodox laid great stress.[1]

The first effect of the separation was to make matters worse rather than better, for lawsuits followed, mostly begun by the Orthodox. The most important, and one in which both sides brought forward their representative men, was the case before the Court of Chancery in New Jersey, in 1830, over some funds belonging to Chesterfield Preparative Meeting. The Orthodox based their plea on doctrine, usages of the Society, and legal points, while the "Hicksites" refused to reply to

[1] Foster's "Report," vol. ii., pp. 414.

any questions of doctrine before a civil tribunal, but rested their case on legal and technical points. Judge Ewing decided in favor of the Orthodox on legal points, and Associate Justice Drake gave his opinion to the same effect on points of doctrine. The case was appealed, but confirmed by the Court of Errors and Appeals, which sustained the first decision by a vote of seven to four.[1] The chancellor, who was also governor, affirmed the decision, adding, with the consent of the court, his personal advice that the matter be settled amicably. This not being done, a bill afterward passed the New Jersey legislature, providing that an equitable division in accordance with numbers be made. This only applied to New Jersey. In Pennsylvania the "Hicksites" retained most of the country meeting-houses, while Orthodox retained Westtown Boarding-school, the Frankford Asylum for the Insane, and the bulk of the city property —by far the lion's share of the whole. Other lawsuits followed in other places.[2]

[1] Janney says that all but one of those who voted in the affirmative afterward signed a paper stating that they did it on the legal ground taken by Justice Ewing. (Janney's "History," vol. iv., p. 334.)

[2] There were two lawsuits in Ohio: one against the Hicksites for the possession of property, which was gained by the Orthodox ("Report of the Trial of Friends at Steubenville, Ohio, 1829," M. T. C. Gould, Philadelphia, Joseph Harding, printer, 1828. For a caustic review of this "Report," see "Miscellaneous Repository," vol. 2, pp. 210 ff.) Another trial against the "Hicksites," for riot, was at first decided in favor of the Orthodox, but on appeal to the Supreme Court was reversed on technical grounds. (See "The Friend," Philadelphia, vol iii., p. 15, "Miscellaneous Repository," vol. 2, pp. 9 ff. vol. 3, 122, 222.) In New York

The Wilbur-Gurney Controversy.

Leaving for a future chapter an account of the progress of the Society, we shall now turn our attention to the other important schism that has occurred. In this the Orthodox bodies only were concerned. It differs from the separation we have just been considering in the longer period which it covers, and in the fact that the doctrinal points were more intricate, the question turning rather on disciplinary points and methods of administration.

The effect of the separation of 1827–28 on the doctrinal position of the Orthodox bodies was to make them insist more strongly than ever on the deity and sacrifice of Jesus Christ, and on the authenticity of the Scriptures. The Orthodox Yearly Meetings, individually and collectively, issued declarations of their faith.

In England a strong evangelical party called "Beaconites" arose in 1836.[1] These advocated an extremely literal mode of interpreting the Bible. They were rather harshly treated, and a small secession took place. Though small it was

the Hicks party gained their suit, the chancellor being unable to see any difference in doctrine or any sufficient plea for the Orthodox claim. In this lawsuit it should be said, however, that the Hicksites entered a statement of doctrines very different from those promulgated by Hicks. See "Summary Statement of Facts, etc., in Relation to the Property Belonging to the Monthly Meeting of Friends in the City of New York," New York, 1838.

[1] So called from a small book entitled, "A Beacon to the Society of Friends," by Isaac Crewdson, one of the leaders.

important, on account of the high position in the Society of those who seceded.[1]

A leading Friend at this time in England was Joseph John Gurney. He had written much on doctrine and in defense of the Society of Friends, and is the most prominent defender of their doctrines since the early days. He was supposed to hold views very similar to those of Isaac Crewdson, the Beaconite leader, and having been on the committee that condemned him, he came in for the share of abuse of both sides that moderate men generally receive. He possessed a most attractive disposition, was very charitable with his great wealth, and was deeply religious. At Oxford he had studied under private tutors; he also came under the influence of Charles Simeon, a noted Low Church divine, and he moved in a circle that was at once refined and spiritual, and inspired by desires to raise their fellow-creatures; for he was the brother of the celebrated Elizabeth Fry, brother-in-law to Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton, the anti-slavery leader, and was the intimate friend of Wilberforce, Clarkson, and others. He entered heartily into all their plans and arrangements, and was an active supporter of the British and Foreign

[1] The literature on this subject is extensive, but is chiefly in pamphlet form. See, however, "Crisis in Quaker Contest at Manchester" (Isaac Crewdson), Manchester, 1837; "Quakerism Examined," etc., John Wilkinson, London, 1836; J. B. Braithwaite, Life of Joseph John Gurney, Norwich and London, 1855, 2d ed., vol. 2, pp. 1–37, 58–63. The seceders numbered about three hundred. J. S. Rowntree, "The Friend" (London), vol. 40, p. 797.

Bible Society.[1] Such a man was naturally held in high esteem among his friends, and soon acquired wide influence. His scholarly education and his mingling with able thinkers of other denominations, together with his desire to spread the truth, as he understood it, among others than Friends, all contributed to make him depart considerably from the older forms of expression that had become obsolete to the general public. He was also more systematic in his modes of thought than Friends were then accustomed to be, and he undoubtedly held more closely to the evangelical school of thought than most Friends before his day, laying great emphasis on imputed righteousness, though always insisting upon a righteous life following it. Some objected to the stress he laid on the Scriptures, on the sanctity of the Sabbath, and to his belief concerning the resurrection, as being legal and external. They also feared his learning and his close intimacy in certain forms of religious work with members of the Church of England.[2]

John Wilbur, a minister from New England, visited Great Britain during the years 1831–33.[3]

[1] He was born near Norwich in 1788, and died in 1847, from the effects of an accident met with while riding.

[2] He was wrongly accused of denying the universal operation of the Spirit of Christ in the soul of man. See his remarks in "Observations on the Distinguishing Doctrines of Friends," pp. 46–47, chap. I., "Addendum."

[3] John Wilbur was born at Hopkinton, R. I., in 1774. His parents were elders among Friends, and he was educated very carefully and strictly in the customs and doctrines of the Society.

He noticed the rising of new methods of teaching, and new positions that were being taken in regard to doctrine, and was greatly grieved. He could not see how anything could be right that in any way tended to alter the formula used by the fathers of the Society. He met with a number who sympathized with him, and continued a correspondence with them after his return from abroad.[1] In 1837 Joseph John Gurney, having received the consent of the lower meetings, requested that of the Yearly Meeting of Ministers and Elders, to his undertaking a journey to America to visit Friends and engage in religious work. A largely preponderating number of those present heartily approved of his purpose, but there were some who decidedly opposed on doctrinal grounds his traveling with their indorsement. They were not sufficiently numerous, however, to prevent the certificate being granted, but by their letters to America did much to influence the minds of John Wilbur and others against him.[2]

The difference between them did not concern what are considered the essentials of Christianity. Wilbur laid great stress on heeding the light

He was disowned by the Orthodox for violation of the Discipline in endeavoring to injure the esteem in which J. J. Gurney was held, by circulating reports as to his unsoundness. His sympathizers soon after effected an organization and received him cordially as a minister. He died in the spring of 1856. (See "Journal" of John Wilbur.)

[1] "Letters to a Friend" (George Crosfield), by John Wilbur, London, 1832.

[2] J. B. Braithwaite, "Life of Joseph John Gurney," vol. 2, pp. 71–74 (a copy of the certificate is given).

within, and thought Gurney placed too much emphasis on the importance of an outward knowledge of the facts of the work of Christ, though Gurney did not teach that these were essential to salvation. He objected to Gurney's position that justification precedes sanctification, and maintained that a man is justified only as he is sanctified. The difference was really in the definition of terms, but the practical result of Wilbur's teaching is that the individual does not expect to know that he is saved. John Wilbur also objected to any method of religious instruction but such as was directly prompted by the Spirit at the time, and believed that the giving of lectures on religious subjects, or the distinct teaching of Bible truth, as is done in Bible schools, was work done "in the will of the creature." Gurney was active in supporting systematic Bible study, though he was as strong as any one in upholding the necessity for immediate qualification and direct guidance in the ministry of the Word. In these points Wilbur was certainly nearer the Friends of the preceding century than Gurney. In the early years of the Society, however, the custom of holding public prearranged discussions was prevalent, and these were more in line with Gurney's methods so far as the principle was concerned.

On Gurney's arrival in New England, John Wilbur waited on him in respect to his doctrines, and found him ready to enter into defense of them and to claim that they were according to the

Quaker standards. This convinced Wilbur that Gurney was unsound, and he traveled about to warn others of him, and wrote letters to Friends in various parts in the same strain. This called out remonstrances from the leading Friends in New England, and committees of his Yearly and quarterly meetings endeavored to induce him to desist. The position of the committee was that inasmuch as Gurney had come to them with full indorsements from the Yearly Meeting of London, it was not competent for them to go behind that certificate, but that they should accept him, until he made himself in some way amenable to their rules.[1] Wilbur, on the other hand, maintained that as Gurney had published to the world his doctrines, they were common property, and that he had a right to demand that his soundness should be investigated, as these writings had never been withdrawn. Neither side would yield, and the frequent conferences between the committee and Wilbur were fruitless.[2]

[1] It will be seen that the plea here was not unlike that used by the sympathizers of Hicks when the Philadelphia elders sought to interfere with him; but the cases are not altogether identical, for Hicks had promulgated doctrines that caused alarm to the elders after his arrival in Philadelphia Yearly Meeting. Gurney had not done this. Another great difficulty lay in this, that the Philadelphia elders did not have confidence in Hicks's home meeting, while New England Friends had unbounded confidence in the parent body in England.

[2] See J. Wilbur, "Narrative and Exposition of the late Proceedings in New England Yearly Meeting," etc., New York, 1845; "Calumny Refuted" (an answer to the preceding), London, 1845; "Narrative of Facts and Circumstances that have tended to produce a secession from the Society of Friends in New

It is not practicable to give a detailed account of the troubles which led to a separation in New England and the setting up of a Wilburite Yearly Meeting in 1845. The Wilburites numbered only five hundred out of a membership of over seven thousand, and their claim to be *the* New England Yearly Meeting was decided against them by the courts on every count.[1]

Although the actual results of the separation were small as to numbers, its effects were wide-reaching. Each of the two bodies addressed Epistles to the other Yearly Meetings, thus bringing up the question of recognition, and thus risking a division in every meeting. None of the Yearly Meetings, formally recognized the Wilbur body, but all except those of Philadelphia and Ohio recognized the Orthodox. In these last two there was such a difference of opinion that they could come to no decision. The prevailing sentiment in Philadelphia was one of sympathy with the Wilburites, but they were so much in the wrong from a disciplinary point of view that their friends had not the strength to endorse their action.[2] In Ohio the matter came up in some shape almost every

England Yearly Meeting," Providence, 1845; "Vindication of the Disciplinary Proceedings of New England Yearly Meeting of Friends," Boston, 1852.

[1] "Report of the Case of Earle," etc., S. C. Bancroft, Boston, 1855.

[2] "Report of Meeting for Sufferings in Relation to the Facts and Causes of the Division in New England Yearly Meeting, in the year 1845." See also "British Friend," vol. 7, p. 253 ff. (document in full).

year for nine years (1845–1854) the feeling growing more and more strong, till it ended in a separation in 1854, over a disagreement as to who should be clerk, the larger portion going with the Wilburites. It is curious that even after the separation the Wilbur body of Ohio did not recognize that of New England until a generation later. In New York a small separation occurred in Dutchess County.

A conference [1] representing all the American Orthodox Yearly Meetings, except Ohio and Philadelphia, met at Baltimore, Maryland, in July 1849, to consider "the present tried state of our Society and to labor for its restoration to that unity and fellowship that formerly characterized it." The conference after careful consideration issued a document reviewing the relations of the Yearly Meetings to each other, and expressing the conviction that any departure from established usage would be "productive of very serious consequences." [2] The conference met again in 1851, and issued another document. This is much more definite in its statements than that of 1849. It entered somewhat into the causes of the lack of harmony

[1] The conference was proposed by New York Yearly Meeting. See Minutes of that meeting, 1848, pp. 23, 24. Notice was sent to all the Orthodox Yearly Meetings in America and also to London and Dublin. The last two declined to send delegates on the ground that it was not advisable for them to enter into the discussion of American affairs.

[2] See "Document prepared by Associated Committees of the Society of Friends who met in Baltimore in the Seventh Month, 1849," Cincinnati, 1850. See also, "Friends' Review," vol. 3, pp. 641 ff., 760 ff., "British Friend," vol. 8, pp. 17–19, 100–102.

and advised and entreated Ohio and Philadelphia Yearly Meetings by name to recognize the "Larger Body" in New England and open correspondence with it.[1] The conference then adjourned. New England released its committee, but on the invitation of the other meetings appointed a committee in 1852 to attend a conference in 1853 "if way opened for it." The conference was held in 1853 again in Baltimore, but "way did not open" for the New England delegates to attend, so only New York, Baltimore, North Carolina, and Indiana were represented. This conference issued a brief report confessing its inability to recommend a practicable course which might tend to restore harmony among the yearly meetings. It then adjourned without day.[2]

So far as differences of doctrine were concerned, it seems that there need not have been any separation. The Orthodox maintained that the action against Wilbur was disciplinary only, and not doctrinal. The "Smaller body" insisted that the doctrines which they accredited to J. J. Gurney were at the root of the troubles and the chief occasion of them. There was an almost essential difference, however, between the attitude of the

[1] "Friend's Review," vol. 4, pp. 643 ff.; "The Friend" (London), vol. 10, pp. 119 ff. (document in full); "The Friend" (Philadelphia), vol. 25, p. 71 (reprinted in "British Friend," vol. 10, p. 128.

[2] "Friends' Review," vol. 6, p. 694; Minutes of Indiana Yearly Meeting. 1853; Minutes of Baltimore Yearly Meeting, 1853.

two parties in regard to Christian work: the Wilbur party being so afraid of what they called "creaturely activity," that they confined their Gospel service almost wholly to their stated Meetings for Worship which were held largely in silence. The Orthodox party did this, but added to it other methods allowing for more definite and regular teaching. Both were active in philanthropic work.

The separation in Ohio produced another shock throughout the Society, and again put every Yearly Meeting in danger of a division, for both meetings again addressed all the others, and each claimed recognition as the one true body. At the time, the two meetings were distinguished by the name of their respective clerks, the "Hoyle Meeting" being the Wilbur body, and the "Binns Meeting" the Orthodox. The "Binns Meeting" was recognized by all the Orthodox Yearly Meetings on both sides of the Atlantic except Philadelphia, which promptly recognized the "Hoyle Meeting." As a consequence, Indiana, and North Carolina, withdrew from further correspondence with Philadelphia. In Baltimore a small separation took place.[1]

In its decisions regarding the later separations, London Yearly Meeting appears to have acted on disciplinary and not on doctrinal grounds. The small separation in New England in 1845,

[1] See "Statement" issued by London Yearly Meeting, 1855, and by Baltimore Yearly Meeting, 1855, both reprinted in Minutes of Indiana Yearly Meeting, 1855.

interfered in no way with the organization of that Yearly Meeting, and as London Yearly Meeting understood that no doctrine was involved, it continued its correspondence with the original body, taking the position of non-interference with the internal concerns of another yearly meeting. It therefore refused to recognize John Wilbur as a Minister when he visited England in 1853. When the separation occurred in Ohio in 1854, the case was different. Benjamin Hoyle had been clerk for a number of years, and there was a difficulty, from the technical point of view, in determining which party was the true Yearly Meeting. The matter claimed the consideration of the committee on Epistles, who reported in favor of the "Binns" Meeting. London Yearly Meeting afterwards spent four hours in consideration of the subject. In its published statement it says that "no proposal was made for accepting, as the Epistle from Ohio Yearly Meeting, the Epistle signed by Benjamin Hoyle." The ground for accepting the Epistle from the "Binns" Meeting was that the Friends who belonged to it had pursued the same course as London Yearly Meeting had done in recognizing the "Larger" body in New England, and objecting to the presence of members from the "Smaller" body in their meetings for discipline.[1]

[1] See "A Statement of the Proceedings of London Yearly Meeting, held in London, 1855, in reference to the Division in Ohio Yearly Meeting," London, 1855.

The pressure in Philadelphia of the sympathizers with the Orthodox bodies was soon so great that that Yearly Meeting, to avoid a separation in its own limits, was forced to abandon its recognition by way of correspondence with the Hoyle body in Ohio, and it gradually retired into the isolated condition it has ever since occupied. It allows members of each body, Orthodox, and Wilburites to sit in its meetings, and will receive certificates of membership from each, but will not receive ministers as ministers when they bring certificates of removal to reside within the limits of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting. Since 1857 it has held correspondence with no other Yearly Meeting,[1] and while it allows ministers from either body to take part in its Meetings for Worship, it will neither read nor record their certificates, nor appoint special meetings for them. Of late years, however, the meeting has begun to show evidence of greater openness, and its ministers have traveled both in America and in other parts of the world. Philadelphia Yearly Meeting is counted, although many of its members favor the Wilburite meetings, as belonging to the Orthodox section.

The future course of the Wilburite Friends may be treated of here. They are perhaps the nearest representatives in the present time of the Friends of the latter part of the eighteenth century,

[1] See "Brief Narrative in Relation to the Position of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Friends, Philadelphia, published in 1872."

except that they are less outreaching than they, for that was a time when many ministers traveled abroad. This may be partly owing to their small numbers, and also partly to their attention in spiritual matters being turned so exclusively to the past.

The troubles resulting in the separation of 1827–28 had been violent but comparatively short; the new difficulties, from the very delicacy of the points involved, were much harder to deal with. Both parties suffered. The Orthodox party needed the balance and weight which the Wilbur element would have afforded, while the latter, without the aggressiveness of the former, inevitably declined in numbers and influence. Their extreme attachment to the forms of a preceding age and the disposition to attach paramount importance to individual guidance, yet largely restricting this within lines determined by precedent, have had their inevitable result in further separation. They are in no sense a proselytizing body. They emphasize the weightier matters, and are very careful to maintain good works, though they do not much affect organized philanthropy. Their meetings are held with a great deal of silence, and in the older meetings Bible-schools are not encouraged. It is understood that these are held in some of the more recently formed meetings, for about 1877 a number of the Conservative members in the Orthodox Yearly Meetings of Western, Iowa, and Kansas, becom-

ing alarmed at the rapid spread of innovations which had come in with revival methods, such as singing, the introduction of "mourners' benches," "human leadership" in meetings, the preaching of instantaneous conversion and of instantaneous sanctification, etc., withdrew from the main body and formed separate Yearly Meetings. Their example for similar reasons was followed by their sympathizers in Canada.[1] They now form a complete circle of Yearly Meetings of their own. Their main educational establishment is at Barnesville, Ohio. It is difficult to gain accurate statistics as to the progress of their membership. Their numbers in New England are greatly reduced in size. Even in Ohio, where they have their greatest strength, there has been a loss, and they are now far smaller than the Orthodox body in that State.[2]

It remains to state that there is still another body of Friends, known to the census as "Primitive." These are really "Wilburite," but more ex-

[1] These new meetings with the older meetings made the body in 1890 number 4529 members in the United States. Including Canada, they have now seven Yearly Meetings, viz., New England, Ohio, Western (Indiana), Iowa, Kansas, and North Carolina (1904). At first they did not officially recognize one another by correspondence, but in time the practice of sending epistles was established. That these later formed Yearly Meetings are "Wilburite" is shown by the fact of the correspondence with the older "Wilburite" bodies, and that the document issued by Philadelphia Meeting for Sufferings, 1849, in relation to the division in New England Yearly Meeting, was republished by the Kansas Separatists, in 1881, as a justification.

[2] The Friends who left Indiana Yearly Meeting at the time of the separation in Ohio are members of Ohio Meeting.

clusive and entirely independent. They number about two hundred and have separated partly from Wilbur bodies and partly from Philadelphia Yearly Meeting on account of what they considered the inconsistent course pursued by these meetings in not going to the logical extent of their position. William Hodgson, the historian, whose work is frequently referred to in these pages, was a member of this branch. His "History" gives a full account of their rise and progress. The chief interest of these Friends is to "maintain the ancient testimonies of the Society" intact, with the idea of bearing witness to the spirituality of the gospel rather than of propagating it.

CHAPTER VI.

PERIOD OF REORGANIZATION.—FURTHER PROGRESS.

AS soon as the separation of 1827–28 was over both Orthodox and "Hicksites" began to strengthen the things that remained, and to go forward as best they could under the somewhat crippled conditions in which they found themselves. Many heartily regretted the separation. Nearly thirty years after, Samuel Bettle, who had been the clerk of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting at the time of the separation in that meeting, and who had sided with the Orthodox party, publicly stated that he believed patient labor and suffering would have been better than division.[1] A careful study of the times can hardly fail to lead to the same conclusion. The Society, never very numerous, presented thereafter a broken front with diminished influence. That some members would have been lost in any case is probable, but the same Book of Discipline continued to be used by the "Hicksites," with the clauses making it a disownable offense to deny the authenticity of the Holy Scriptures and the divinity of Jesus Christ.[2]

[1] Hodgson, vol. ii., pp. 219, 220.

[2] A revision of the Discipline in their Baltimore Yearly Meeting has removed the clauses relating to disownment, and somewhat weakened the doctrinal statements.

The leaders who agreed with Hicks held views very different from the Orthodox; but many of those who followed them did so in order to maintain what they felt was right liberty. In the Yearly Meetings of New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, where their great strength lay, theirs was the popular party. This fact became their strength and their weakness, for while they gained numbers they also received the larger proportion of those who had no settled convictions, but who went with the current. Most of those who sided with the Orthodox did so from personal conviction, and therefore added strength to them. Many on both sides, however, adopted the course they took from social and family motives.

The "Hicksites."

As has been said, it would be most unjust to credit Hicks's doctrines to even a majority of those who are popularly called by his name. Their fundamental principle was that in matters of doctrine there should be the fullest liberty. They therefore freely accepted Hicks and indorsed him as a minister without thereby assuming to adopt his opinions.[1] The first effect of the separation on them, however, at least in Philadelphia, seems to have been to cause a reaction in favor of more

[1] The Orthodox claimed that by this action they virtually took the ground that belief as to the outward appearing and work of Jesus Christ is a matter of indifference, and thereby opened the door for and even invited unbelief.

"orthodox" teaching. At all events, they addressed an Epistle to London Yearly Meeting in 1830,[1] in which they protest that they hold *essentially* the same doctrines as they had always held, and that English Friends have misjudged them on *ex parte* testimony. They claim that the dissensions have not been caused by doctrinal differences so much as by the "exercise of an oppressive authority in the church." They also claim to accept the Scriptures with their record of Jesus Christ, and the fundamental principle of the light of Christ within, as God's gift for man's salvation, and all the blessed doctrines which grow from it as their root. They end by referring to their large majority over the other branch.[2]

An Epistle issued by London Yearly Meeting in 1829 explains the position of that Yearly Meeting at that time. After saying: "This meeting has been introduced into a feeling of much sympathy and brotherly love for our brethern on the American continent," the Epistle proceeds to declare the faith of Friends in the inspiration and divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, and in the

[1] "Journal" of John Comly, Appendix, p. 638 (containing a copy of the Epistle).

[2] This Epistle was not sent without earnest protest. The clerk of the Woman's Meeting at the time, the afterward celebrated Lucretia Mott, opposed it very positively, on the ground that "it contained sentiments utterly opposed to her own convictions, and to what she believed to be the inherent spirit of Quakerism." She was overruled, but signed it in her official capacity. She was so far justified by the fact that the document was not read in London Yearly Meeting at large, and was returned in a rather peremptory manner. ("James and Lucretia Mott," p. 167, and note.)

person and work of Jesus Christ, as the propitiation and sacrifice for sin as well as the Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world. It then goes on to say "Our religious Society, from its earliest establishment to the present day, has received these most important doctrines of Holy Scripture in their plain obvious acceptation; and we do not acknowledge as in fellowship with us, as a Christian community, any body of religious professors which does not thus accept them, or which openly receives and accredits as Ministers, those who attempt to invalidate any of these doctrines which we esteem as essential parts of the Christian Religion."

Memoirs of prominent members of the Society about this time show that the doctrinal question was by no means settled. Lucretia Mott herself met with serious opposition on account of her views, which were almost rationalistic. But any "orthodox" reaction was overpowered, and the era of freedom of expression on points of doctrine was established.[1]

[1] Edward Hicks, one of their prominent ministers at the time of the separation, writes in 1840 complaining of the growing power of the Unitarian element, and says that Elias Hicks never meant to introduce this, but only to prevent Friends from running to the opposite extreme of Trinitarianism; that before his death the old man, seeing how things were going, had said that he was more afraid of his professed Friends than his professed enemies. "But," adds Edward Hicks, "had he lived till now, he would have found gallery members of his branch of Friends having less reverence for Jesus Christ than the Turks, and have heard one of their prominent ministers declare from a Quaker gallery that a Roman Catholic priest in Ireland had done more good than ever Jesus Christ had done." ("Memoirs" of Edward Hicks.)

Lucretia Mott was probably the ablest representative of the extreme radical school of thought in the Society. She worked in connection with the Free Religious Association, was a member of the Anti-Sabbath Association, and appeared to have grave doubts on the subject of the future life. Her statements concerning Jesus Christ are most radical, and she took the ground that the Bible was a dangerous book. She had, however, great faith in righteousness, and labored with persistent zeal and untiring perseverance on behalf of the slave, often enduring no little opposition and sometimes being in danger of violence. Nothing could daunt her in this work, and she lived down opposition both inside and outside of her Society. It was undoubtedly her strong and successful efforts on behalf of the negro that served to turn the attention of her fellow-members from her radical doctrines and to give her the great place in their love and esteem which she attained during the latter years of her life.[1]

There has always been a minority of Friends belonging to this branch who entertain views closely approximating evangelical doctrines; so, in full accord with the foundation principle of freedom which underlies the "Hicksite" branch of the Friends one can hear very differing views advocated in the same meeting. As a body this

[1] See "Life of James and Lucretia Mott." She was the daughter of Thomas and Anna Coffin, and was born in Nantucket, 1793; she married James Mott, Jr., in 1811, and died in 1880.

branch has given special attention to philanthropy and moral reform. First for the slave, and now for peace, total abstinence from alcoholic beverages, and other movements for the uplifting of humanity, their members, both in their corporate capacity and individually, have been active and efficient. In the field of literature, Samuel M. Janney, a prominent minister in Loudoun County, Virginia, is acknowledged to have produced the most authoritative life of William Penn that has appeared.[1]

This branch of the Friends has been much interested in education, having had under the care of their members, and still having, a number of institutions for learning, of all grades.[2] One of the earliest of these was the Alexandria Boarding-school in Virginia, under the charge of Benjamin Hallowell. It was opened in 1824, and continued thirty-four years. Many sons of slave-owners were in attendance. The school attained wide celebrity, especially for its superior instruction in advanced

[1] Orthodox Friends take exception to his "Life of George Fox" and to the doctrinal parts of his "History of Friends," as not giving sufficient weight to the evangelical views of early Friends. His section on the causes of the separation is a very able production, but is far from being an impartial account.

[2] A great deal of the information concerning the educational institutions among Friends of both branches is gathered from an able account of them by Edward H. Magill, LL.D., late president of Swarthmore College, Pa., which is to be found in "The Proceedings of the Friends' Religious Congress, Chicago, 9th mo., 1893." ("Hicksite" Conference.) Almost the only criticism on the paper that can be made is that he writes as if all the institutionswere under one body, a method which is very likely to cause confusion in the mind of a reader who is not acquainted with the particulars.

mathematics. General Robert E. Lee and General Kirby Smith were among the students. Benjamin Hallowell was also a prominent minister, and was greatly esteemed for his high character and abilities. A very important school, considered by some as the precursor of Swarthmore College, was begun in 1838 by John and Rachel Jackson, near Darby, Pa. It was among the first which offered advanced educational privileges to young women. John Jackson imported the largest refracting telescope owned at the time by any individual in the United States. Since 1845 there has been a day-school for boys and girls under the care of the three monthly meetings in Philadelphia. It now numbers six hundred pupils, and is a very thorough institution. Its students, who belong to all denominations, regularly attend with their teachers the midweek meeting for worship. Other schools which may be mentioned are: Friends' Seminary, New York (1861), Friends' School in Brooklyn (1867), which together have an endowment of $100,000; Friends' Elementary and High School, Baltimore, Md. (1864), and the George School (1893) at Newtown, Pa. By the will of the late John M. George, of Overbrook, Pennsylvania, about $750,000 has been left for this school. The grounds contain 227 acres, and suitable buildings have been erected at an entire cost of $150,000. It is a coeducational boarding-school, and has scientific, classical, and literary courses.

Their leading educational institution is Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania, founded in 1869. It is under the management of members of the body, both men and women being on the board. The value of land and buildings, apparatus, etc., is estimated at over half a million dollars, and its permanent endowment fund is about the same. The instruction is liberal and thorough. The main building was totally destroyed by fire in 1881, but was restored in one year by the subscriptions of Friends without incurring any debt. In 1905 over $600,000, was added by private subscriptions to the endowment of the college. Its influence on other schools in the Society is great, and many of them, for we have only mentioned a few of the number, arrange their courses to enable their students to enter the freshman class at Swarthmore on certificate of the principal. The Indian work of the Society will be treated in connection with that of the Orthodox body.

The number of the "Hicksite" body is set down in the census of 1890 was 21,992.[1] They are exclusively confined to the United States and Canada, and are divided into seven Yearly Meetings, viz., New York, Genesee (Western New York and Canada), Philadelphia, Baltimore, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. Of these Genesee and Illinois have been established since the separation. Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, comprises more than half the entire membership. Their numbers have

[1] This of course does not include the members in Canada

seriously declined, for in 1830 they claimed to have a combined membership of 31,000 and over, in the Yearly Meetings of New York and Philadelphia alone.[1] Their other Yearly Meetings could not have aggregated less than six or seven thousand at that time, and were probably more. According to the latest available statistics and estimates the total membership is (in 1905). 20,848.

Of recent years there has been a revival of a feeling for the support and spread of their views. An enthusiastic conference on philanthropic work was held in 1892 at Goose Creek, Lincoln, Loudoun County, Va., attended by delegates from all parts. Their conference at the Congress of Religions at Chicago in 1893 was a great success.[2] They have flourishing "First-day schools," some of which have adopted the International Lessons, and others a series of lessons selected and prepared by a Central Committee of their own body. They have been very successful in forming social and literary organizations which interest and hold their younger members.

The latest statement of their doctrine was given by Howard M. Jenkins, late senior editor of the "Friends' Intelligencer" of Philadelphia, in his "Statement of the Faith of Friends"[3] at the Con-

[1] Foster's "Report," vol. ii., pp. 461–464.

[2] See next chapter.

[3] "Proceedings of the Religious Congress of Friends in the World's Parliament of Religions, Chicago, 1893," p. 22. See also "What Makes a Friend," "Chautauquan," April, 1894, by John J. Cornell.

gress in Chicago. Without giving the statement in full, we may say that they hold that God "directly reveals Himself to the perceptions of man; that his light shines into our souls, if we admit it, and becomes thus 'God's gift for man's salvation.' The Scriptures confirm this immediate revelation, and record the visitations of God to the souls of men in past ages," and present us with the truths of the Christian dispensation. "We therefore," he says, "revere the Scriptures, and desire to become possessors of the truth they contain." This is to be accomplished through the same Spirit by which they were given forth. On the divinity of Christ he says: "Convinced that the divine nature, the Christ spirit, the Word 'which was in the beginning,' dwelt in Jesus in an unparalleled and, to our finite perceptions, an immeasurable degree, we regard him (as John G. Whittier has formulated it) as 'the highest possible manifestation of God in man.'"[1] There is no statement of their belief as to salvation through Christ Jesus.

The Orthodox.

In the Yearly Meetings of New England, Virginia,[2] and North Carolina there was no break in

[1] It seems but justice to John G. Whittier, who was a member of Orthodox Friends, to say that, while he was full of universal love and recognized the good in all, he distinctly accepted the orthodox view of Christ Jesus, as he personally assured the writer of this sketch.

[2] The meetings in Virginia in which a separation took place belonged to Baltimore Yearly Meeting, and still do so.

the progress of events, as no separation had occurred in them. In the remaining Yearly Meetings, one of the first things done was the appointment of committees by the Yearly Meetings to go throughout the territory under their care, and bring together the weak-hearted, and, where necessary, organize new meetings. A great deal of difficulty was felt in the fact that both bodies claimed the title of the Society of Friends, so that there was no easy way of distinguishing them. It is largely to this cause that must be attributed the long survival of unpleasant feeling that even now, after a lapse of nearly eighty years, has not quite died out. Many of the meetings of the Orthodox adopted as their official title, in addition to their previous name, "in unity with the ancient Yearly Meetings of Friends," and were incorporated in this way.[1]

Soon after the separation a conference met in Philadelphia composed of delegates from each of the Orthodox Yearly Meetings on the Continent,

[1] Thus the incorporated name of Baltimore Monthly Meeting (Orthodox) is "Baltimore Monthly Meeting of Friends for the Eastern and Western Districts, in unity with the ancient Yearly Meetings of Friends." The last clause is now generally omitted, and for practical use is almost entirely given up.

Another means, employed by both sections, is the appointment of correspondents, who are well-known Friends, whose duty it is to indorse all official documents issued to other Yearly Meetings as evidence of their genuineness. They have no other duties except this and to receive the communications from other meetings and hand them over to the proper officers. The Orthodox body has now generally accepted the title of Orthodox, though unofficially, except in the case of Baltimore Yearly Meeting. Some of the western Yearly Meetings have changed their name to "Friends' Church."

which issued a Declaration of Faith. This was accepted by all the Yearly Meetings as a statement of their belief, but not in any sense as a binding creed, and it is now only an interesting presentation of the ground then taken by Friends.[1]

In 1830 the Friends in Philadelphia formed a Bible Society, which soon had branches in different parts of the country, and did a great work in supplying Bibles at moderate cost to the membership.[2] About the same time, Hannah C. Backhouse, of England, visited America (1830–35) in company with her husband, Jonathan Backhouse, also a minister. She found much neglect of the Bible among American Friends, a matter of great sorrow to her, and she established the first Bible-schools among them.[3] The movement was not rapid at first, but for many years such schools have been almost universal in this branch of the Friends. Most of the schools use the International Lessons, and all the Yearly Meetings except one have standing committees whose duty it is to encourage and help the schools in the various localities.[4]

The separation had also the effect of arousing the literary activity of the members. In Phila-

[1] "The Testimony of the Society of Friends on the Continent of America," New York, printed by Richard and George S. Wood, 1830 (36 pp.).

[2] See note, p. 121.

[3] "Few can estimate the value of H. C. Backhouse's labors in America, and the permanent results which have followed, and are still developing" (nearly twenty years later). ("Journal and Letters of H. C. Backhouse," p. 133.)

[4] Except in some points of method, these schools are very similar to the Sunday-schools of other denominations.

delphia Thomas Evans issued an "Exposition" of Friends' doctrines, dwelling chiefly on the testimony of the earliest Friends to the divinity of Christ and his salvation. He and his brother William soon after edited very ably a series of volumes entitled "Friends' Library," in which were reproduced, in a rather more modern form, the lives and writings of many of the early worthies of the Society. The work reached to fourteen volumes. About the time of the separation the weekly periodical known as "The Friend" (Philadelphia) was established, and is now the oldest periodical published anywhere under the name of Friends. It represents the conservative element of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting. There has been no appreciable change in its shape, size, or appearance during its existence of nearly eighty years.

There was for a number of years following 1828 much ministerial activity, and a number of ministers traveled up and down the country visiting the congregations of Friends, and also holding meetings to some extent with the public. Among these ministers was Stephen Grellet, "a modern apostle," as he has been termed, whose life is one of the most remarkable, not only among the preachers of his own denomination, but of all denominations in the nineteenth century.[1] The influence of the traveling ministers can hardly be

[1] See "Life of Stephen Grellet," by B. Seebohm, London, 1860; R. G. Horton, "Verbum Dei," p. 64, London, 1893.

overestimated. It served to maintain many a small congregation in hope and life, and also to arouse many who were not in membership, and though, owing to special reasons, there was little effort made to proselytize, yet the religious influence exerted by these preachers on persons outside the Society has been great.

The chief influence exerted by the Friends, as it has been mentioned in regard to the organization, was in the careful and just lives of their members. The Quaker character became proverbial for probity, and it would be difficult to find any movement that promised on right lines to benefit man that had not received support from Friends to an extent out of all proportion to their numbers.

We have seen how they liberated their slaves at a time when the consciences of the Christians of the country at large were quite asleep on the subject. Their efforts on behalf of the negro did not stop here, but they immediately began to try to influence society around them to see the iniquity of slavery. Their method was entirely moral suasion, and not political action; and they confined themselves to petitioning legislatures, to appeal, and to personal influence so far as the masters were concerned; and in regard to the slaves, they refused to countenance the evil system in any way that they could possibly avoid. They would not hire slave labor. Many of them refused to buy slave-grown or slave-produced articles. When they saw any case of peculiar distress

where families were being separated by being sold away from one another, the Friends as far as they could would buy them in, and then arrange for their freedom, the freed negro frequently, by working on part wages or by saving, repaying the money spent for him. Many of the Friends took great interest in the religious and intellectual development of this race, and in States where it was illegal for colored people to hold gatherings without the presence of some white persons, they would not infrequently attend regularly, for the chief purpose of affording them an opportunity to hold meetings in their own way, though very often the Friends also would have something to say. Others, at the risk of imprisonment if discovered, taught continuously through a series of years in night-schools for colored persons held privately for fear of detection. In these quiet ways, with great diligence and patience, the Friends labored in a movement entirely distinct from what is now known as the political abolition movement. When this arose the body of Friends greatly regretted it, and for a number of years refused to sanction what they felt to be a movement with good purposes, but using methods inconsistent with the peaceable religion of Christ. Officially, none of the Yearly Meetings, so far as known, ever sanctioned any political party. Soon, however, the fire of the new crusade aroused many earnest Friends, and they began to sympathize and labor together with the abolitionists.

This aroused even more opposition in the Orthodox than it had in the Hicksite ranks, and the current of feeling ran so high that in Indiana Yearly Meeting there was in 1842–1843 a considerable secession from the main body, and a new organization was formed under the name of Indiana Yearly Meeting of Antislavery Friends. Their number was about 2000, while that of the main body was 25,000. No lawsuits resulted, and the Orthodox body, which had been rather high-handed before the separation, seems quickly to have perceived its mistake, and practically to have abandoned the position that caused the separation. No other Yearly Meeting on the Continent recognized the new body. London Yearly Meeting, in which the sentiment in favor of antislavery was very strong, sent over a deputation to Indiana in hopes of reconciling the two bodies. Their action was not altogether appreciated by the antislavery Friends, but the effect desired was eventually brought about, and after ten years the new body formally dissolved, leaving its members free to act as they thought best. Some were lost to the Society, but many, perhaps most, of them quietly returned to the original organization, where they were received with open arms, and some of them became very prominent.[1]

[1] "History of the Separation in Indiana Yearly Meeting, 1842–43 on Anti-Slavery Question, etc. Walter Edgerton, Cincinnati, 1856"; Hodgson, vol. ii., pp. 9–49. For an account of the English deputation's labors from an inside point of view, see "Memoirs of William Forster," vol. ii., pp. 193–210.

About this time John Greenleaf Whittier came into prominence as a true poet who had espoused the cause of the slave. There is no doubt that his thorough identification with the antislavery cause was a wonderful help to it, and that his influence helped to raise it above the immediate issues of the present and did much to make its advocates see that they were in line with the eternal movement of right. He was through all a Quaker and never advocated force. Besides his songs for freedom, perhaps no one has done more to make current the Quaker conception of Christianity.[1] He was born at Haverhill, Massachusetts, 1807, and died at Hampton Falls, New Hampshire, September 7, 1892.

A large majority of the Friends, at least in the North and West, voted for Lincoln in 1860 as the representative of the party that advocated freedom, though at that time the idea of freedom in the States where slavery already existed was not contemplated. As the war drew on, not a few of the antislavery men and not a few Friends thoroughly agreed with the position taken by Whittier and Garrison, that it would better to stand by, "the sad spectators of a suicide," than to engage in fratricidal war. As a body, Friends of all parties endeavored to maintain their ground in favor of peace. Whittier came out strongly, in a poem addressed to the alumni of Friends' Boarding-school, Providence, telling them plainly that they

[1] See note, p. 168.

cannot take the battle-brand, but that they are now to suffer for the sake of their principles as well as with their country, and must not expect that because they believe it is wrong to fight they are to be spared their share of sorrow. His manly words doubtless stirred many to renewed faithfulness. But not a few felt the dilemma put by President Lincoln in a letter written by him to the widow of Joseph John Gurney, then residing in New Jersey. After speaking of his appreciation of a visit she had paid him, and of her letter to him,[1] he says: "Your people, the Friends, have had and are having a very great trial. On principle and faith opposed to both war and oppression, they can only practically oppose oppression by war. In this hard dilemma some have chosen one horn and some the other. For those appealing to me on conscientious grounds I have done and shall do the best I could and can, in my own conscience, under my oath to the law."[2]

Eliza P. Gurney in her reply to the President clearly and forcibly maintains the alternative that wrong is not to be set right by wrong. There were some in the Society who thought otherwise, and not a few of both branches were found in the army. It was a "Hicksite Quaker" who wrote the

[1] The visit referred to was "a religious visit," in which Eliza P. Gurney gave him what she felt to be a message from the Lord. The letter was written at his request, and after his assassination was found in his breast-pocket.

[2] "Memoirs and Correspondence of Eliza P. Gurney," p. 317. The letter is given in facsimile. The original is now in possession of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

song "We are coming, Father Abram."[1] Much has been said about the number of Friends in the army, but more than the occasion warrants. The peculiar custom which grew up of admitting the children of Friends as full members by right of birth, with all its undeniable advantages had this drawback, that many who had never made any Christian profession were counted as Friends, and when these enlisted it was considered that they had forsaken their position, when in reality many of them had nothing but a traditional position on the subject. In many cases those who enlisted were disowned by their meetings, in many others their acknowledgment of regret was accepted, and in others no action was taken. On the other hand, there were numerous instances of persons who were faithful to their testimony for peace amid much that was painful. This was specially the case in the South, where the Friends refused in the face of positive persecution and much physical suffering to bear arms. None of them absolutely lost their lives, but on several occasions they were ordered to be shot, but the soldiers, impressed with their Christian courage and patience, refused to obey the command. Some were deprived of food and drink, and subjected to many and humiliating punishments, but they remained firm.[2] The Confederate Government

[1] James S. Gibbons, see "Life of Abby H. Gibbons," New York, 1897, vol. 1, p. 295.

[2] See Fernando G. Cartland, "Southern Heroes," Cambridge, Mass., 1895; "Account of the Sufferings of Friends of North

created an exemption tax, which not a few paid, while others did not feel that such a course would be right, and chose rather to suffer. It was a noticeable fact that this firm stand on the part of the Friends resulted in North Carolina in an actual increase in membership, others being so deeply impressed with their faithfulness that they examined into their principles and joined them, although the exemption privilege was not granted to new members. The close of the war found Friends more earnest in the promotion of peace, and they formed themselves into a Peace Association of Friends in America, which put lecturers into the field, and issued tracts, and soon started a monthly periodical, called "The Messenger of Peace." The Association was heartily sustained by the various Yearly Meetings, though after a number of years the interest in evangelization turned the attention of Friends in other directions. More recently, however, it has shown new life, and has lately been incorported under the laws of Indiana, and is pressing the cause with more vigor.

The Indians, Colored Population, etc.

From the time of George Fox and William Penn there has been great interest felt by Friends in the Indians, and on their part this much-injured people

Carolina Yearly Meeting, 1861–1865," 2d Edition, Philadelphia, 1868; also London, 1868. See also Friends' Quarterly Examiner, vol. 3, pp. 29 ff., London, 1869.

are said to have retained to this day their affection for and confidence in the Friends. So far as the records go to which there has been access, the Society has always maintained a kindly and just attitude toward them. The early history has already been referred to. It remains to speak of the later history. The various Yearly Meetings had schools and various mission interests among the Indians, which appear to have been measurably successful, especially as regards the general well-being of the tribes under their control, and, whenever opportunity offered, Friends were ready to appear on behalf of the red man before the government. That they undertook to any great extent the work of evangelization of the tribes does not appear. How the Friends became more closely identified with the education and training of the Indians is an interesting history. The following extract from President Grant's first Annual Message to Congress puts the whole matter concisely, and describes the reasons for the new plan which he inaugurated. He writes: "From the foundation of the government to the present, the management of the original inhabitants of this continent, the Indians, has been a subject of embarrassment and expense, and has been attended with continuous robberies, murders, and wars. From my own experience upon the frontiers and in Indian countries, I do not hold either legislation, or the conduct of the whites who come in contact with the Indian, blameless for these hos-

tilities. The past, however, cannot be undone, and the question must be met as we now find it. I have attempted a new policy toward these wards of the nation (they cannot be regarded in any other light than as wards), with fair results so far as tried, and which I hope will be attended ultimately with great success. The Society of Friends is well known as having succeeded in living in peace with the Indians in the early settlement of Pennsylvania, while their white neighbors of other sects in other sections were constantly embroiled. They are also known for their opposition to all strife, violence, and war, and are generally noted for their strict integrity and fair dealings. These considerations induced me to give the management of a few reservations of Indians to them, and to lay the burden of the selection of agents upon the Society itself. The result has proven most satisfactory."[1]

In his message for 1870 President Grant further develops his plan and the underlying idea in his mind. He says: "The experiment of making it a missionary work was tried with a few agencies given to the denomination of Friends, and has been found to work most advantageously. . . . Indian agencies being civil offices, I determined to give all the agencies to such religious denominations as had heretofore established missionaries among the Indians, and perhaps to some other

[1] "Messages of the Presidents," vol. 7, p. 38; "Messages and Documents, 1869–70," p. 14.

denominations who would undertake the work on the same terms, i. e., as a missionary work. The societies selected are allowed to name their own agents, subject to the approval of the Executive, and are expected to watch over them and aid them as missionaries, to Christianize and civilize the Indian, and to train him in the arts of peace. . . . I entertain the confident hope that the policy now pursued will, in a few years, bring all the Indians upon reservations, where they will live in houses, have schoolhouses and churches, and will be pursuing self-sustaining avocations, and where they may be visited by the law-abiding white man with the same impunity that he now visits the civilized white settlements." [1]

This inauguration of a new and honest and Christian policy on the part of the government toward the Indians is one of the brightest parts of President Grant's administration. The exact plan as he marked it out has not been pursued by his successors, but the impetus it gave to the cause of the Indian and the far-reaching results that have since been attained may be said to date their rise from the action of the President as described in these messages. It is not too much to claim that the enlightened policy of William Penn, adopted from conscientious adherence to the principles of peace and justice—a policy followed faithfully by those who came after him—was the direct influence

1 "Messages of the Presidents," vol. 7, p. 109; "Annual Message, etc.," vol. i., p. 17.

that moved President Grant in the adoption of his policy. His practical eye had seen the failure of injustice, greed, and war, and had seen the success of justice and peace, and he chose the latter.

The Society of Friends in its various branches—for both Orthodox and "Hicksites" were engaged in the work, though independently of each other—continued to do their share of work for the Indians in connection with the government for about fifteen years, their last agent having withdrawn in 1885. The accounts of all the agents nominated by Friends were honorably settled. "In every case where suits have been brought against them in the United States courts, our Friends have been honorably acquitted, and the cost thrown upon the government."[1]

The cessation of the work in connection with the government, only served to turn the attention of Friends more particularly to the subject of evangelization among the Indians, which they have carried out ever since with encouraging success, so that there were in 1904, four hundred and seventeen members of the Orthodox Society among the Indians, with four monthly meetings.

Perhaps the most wonderful instance of the power of kind Christian treatment over the un-

[1] Report of Committee on Indian Affairs. See Baltimore Yearly Meeting (Orthodox) Minutes, 1886, p. 39. At one time Friends (Orthodox) had a Superintendent of Indian Affairs, eight Indian Agents, and eighty-five other members acting as employees under the government. Their Christian influence was active, and it is safe to state that hundreds of Indians came through their efforts to a character-changing faith in Christ.

tamed savage is shown in the history of the Modocs. After they were conquered they were taken directly from the lava beds, where they had made such a desperate stand, and put under the peaceful care of the Friends. The change that soon came over their wild natures was marvelous. Steamboat Frank, who had been a terror to his enemies, was not only converted, but became in a comparatively short time a minister of the gospel among Friends, and an evangelist of real power and effectiveness. He so firmly adopted the principles of peace that he would not bear a deadly weapon even as an officer of the peace, and once when his brother was unjustly struck down beside him by a white man, he simply remarked that there had been a time when he would in an instant have slain the aggressor, but that now he was of a different spirit. He died a few years since, while in Portland, Maine, whither he had gone to attend the Yearly Meeting of Friends for New England. The history of the success that the Friends have had with the Indians, as well as the success attained by other denominations, is a standing proof that the Indians, after all these generations of wrong treatment at the hands of the stronger race, are still open to kindness and justice. In all movements for the protection and advancement of the Indian those who are working have the solid support of members of the Society of Friends, both "Hicksite" and Orthodox.

Friends have also continued their interest in the welfare of the negro, but in this respect have hardly come up to what might have been expected from them after their earlier labors on their behalf. It would have been supposed that of all the others they would have been foremost to establish missions and labor among them, but this has not been the case. However, they have done a good deal. Southland College, Arkansas, has for years been doing a patient, steady, and successful work, and has turned out many who have been able as teachers and in other ways have aided to raise their fellow-people. Friends in the North[1] have missions in Virginia, North Carolina and Tennessee, and various institutions not under the care of Friends are, assisted by them. Not very many of this race have joined the Society, though there are some who have done so, and a few have become ministers among them.[2]

Philanthropy, Education, etc.

In regard to general labor for the advancement of the poor, Friends have been more in the habit of uniting with others than in carrying on independent work of their own. As a rule they have been conspicuous for their solid sense and steadiness of purpose, and have been rather the stalwart

[1] This is specially true of New York and Philadelphia Yearly Meetings.

[2] It is believed that this statement applies only to the Orthodox.

supporters of movements than the ones who appeared before the public as leaders. They have been stronger in council than in the brilliant excercise of gifts, and in plain practical common sense than in the graceful accomplishments. For this reason the service done by Friends to the various movements has often been overlooked. They have not seldom given the needed suggestion at the right time. Thus it is said to have been a Friend who was the means of starting Father Matthew on his great temperance work in Ireland. The modern idea of fresh-air funds and free sanitariums for sick children during the summer months is not new among Friends. "The Annual Association of Women Friends for the Relief of Sick Children in the Summer Season" was in full running order in Philadelphia in the summer of 1849, with a corps of nine physicians, ready to furnish free excursions by rail or steamboat, and in extreme cases to procure free board in the country for mothers with their sick infants.[1] Later the work of Sarah Smith in the Indiana penitentiary, where she was for many years matron, must not be overlooked. She was one of the band of noble women who demonstrated that to treat criminals kindly and as human beings should be treated was not only humane, but eminently the wise thing to do for their reformation.

The interest of the "Hicksites" in the cause of temperance has been noted, and the Orthodox

[1] "Friends' Review," Philadelphia, vol. ii., p. 576.

have not been behind them. Every Yearly Meeting has special committees on the subject, and, with perhaps no exception, the Disciplines of all make the manufacture and sale, of intoxicating liquors for use as a beverage a disownable offense. The Western Yearly Meetings are particularly earnest in the cause of the absolute prohibition of the traffic.

The interest of Friends in education developed early, and while they did not produce great scholars, they were able to keep the average educational standard of their members at a higher level than that of the community around them. This, with their strict moral discipline, made them generally persons of considerable influence in every neighborhood where they were found. New York Yearly Meeting opened the first boarding-school for Friends' children at Nine Partners, Dutchess Co., New York in 1796. It was for children of both sexes. Moral training was made primary, and intellectual training secondary. After the separation it remained in the hands of the Orthodox Friends. About thirty years ago it was moved to Union Springs, New York where it is still succesfully carried on.

The next movement, three years later (1799) was the establishment of a boarding-school at Westtown,[1] Chester County, Pennsylvania by

[1] It is not generally known that the establishment of this school was largely due to the celebrated John Dickinson, the author of "The Farmer's Letters," member of the Continental

Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, on an estate of six hundred acres. It was also for both sexes. The school has exercised for more than a century a very wide and deep influence upon Friends of Philadelphia and Baltimore Yearly Meetings. The teaching is thorough and the discipline strict. At the separation it remained in the hands of the Orthodox. In 1887 handsome new buildings, with all modern improvements, were occupied.

In 1819 New England Yearly Meeting, influenced largely by the philanthropist Moses Brown, who had for years labored to establish such a school, and had given valuable land in Providence, Rhode Island for the purpose, opened "Friends' Boarding-school." This school has been exceedingly successful, and has been to New England what Westtown has been to Pennsylvania. In 1904 the name was changed to "The Moses Brown School." It is coeducational, and has in recent years become very liberal in its policy, so that many of its students are not Friends. Moses Brown, above mentioned, was also one of the greatest benefactors of Brown University, and through his influence the charter provides that a certain proportion of the trustees, who are chosen from various religious denominations, shall be Friends.[1]

Congress, etc. He and his wife contributed to its endowment ("Life and Times of John Dickinson," C. J. Stillé, Philadelphia, 1891, pp. 328, 329.)

[1] See "Sketch of Moses Brown," by Augustine Jones, principal of Friends' Boarding-school, Providence, 1893.

Soon after the separation of 1827–28 the subject of more advanced education claimed the attention of Orthodox Friends, with the result of establishing Haverford School, in 1833, at Haverford, Pennsylvania. After several years of successful operation it had pecuniary difficulties and was closed for about three years, but was reopened in 1848. Though having a collegiate course, it did not apply for a charter as a college until 1856, being the first institution of the Society to assume that position. It is under the control of a corporation all the members of which must be Friends. It is, however, practically unsectarian in its teaching. It ranks high among the smaller colleges of the country. Among its professors have been Thomas Chase, of the American Company of Revisers of the New Testament, and an editor of a number of the classics, and also J. Rendel Harris, who during his professorship discovered the long-lost "Apology of Aristides" in the convent on Mount Sinai.[1]

The Friends of North Carolina opened New Garden Boarding-school in 1837. The great prejudice against Friends on account of their anti-slavery principles made the work difficult. The school was conducted during the whole Civil War on a gold basis, and came out without embarrassment, and without having missed a class—a record

[1] In 1897, the college, as residuary legatee, came into the possession of the estate of Jacob P. Jones, amounting to about one million dollars, making the total endowment about $1,500,000.

which from a financial as well as an educational point of view was probably unique in the South during that period. In 1888 the school was raised to the rank of a college, and is now known as Guilford College. It is coeducational.

The Friends in the West owing to the circumstances of their position were naturally somewhat later in the establishment of Boarding-schools. In 1847 one was established, under the care of Indiana Yearly Meeting, near Richmond, Indiana, which in 1859 was chartered as Earlham College. It is in a flourishing condition, under the joint control of Indiana and Western Yearly Meetings. Wilmington College, Wilmington, Ohio, was opened 1871, and Penn College, Oskaloosa, Iowa in 1873. Both these are doing good work. In addition to these is Pacific College, Newberg, Oregon (1891), and Pickering College, Pickering, Ontario, Canada, Whittier College, California, and Friends University, Wichita, Kansas, (1898).

A very important college for women was founded at Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania, 1885, in accordance with the will of Dr. Joseph W. Taylor, a Friend of Burlington, New Jersey. By its charter all the trustees are required to be members of the Society of Friends (Orthodox), but it cannot be classed as a denominational college. It has extensive and beautiful buildings, and is the most advanced college for women in the country. Its endowment is about $1,300,000.

There are many schools and academies under

the control of Friends which cannot be named. As with the "Hicksites," the Orthodox have taken great interest in educational matters, and in 1877 an important and influential conference on education was held at Baltimore, which was followed by others; and in addition to these, local conferences have frequently been held.

CHAPTER VII.

LATER YEARS (NINETEENTH CENTURY) ORTHODOX.

THE great awakening of the separation was not lost, and the body came more and more into something of the spirit of the earlier age. The progress was, however, slow at first, and the casual observer would have noticed but little change. The Friends in different parts of the country presented very different aspects as to numbers. In the East generally there was for over thirty years a steady decline, the chief cause being emigration. In New England the attractions of the West were peculiarly enticing to the practical-minded Friend. The failure of the whale fisheries of Nantucket and New Bedford led to a very general exodus.[1] Emigration acted as a less important factor in New York and Pennsylvania, but farther south another cause operated with great force. The many disabilities that Friends suffered in slaveholding States from their faithful adherence to their position that it was wrong to hold fellow-beings in slavery were a great drag

[1] On the Island of Nantucket there were sixty years ago about twelve hundred Friends; there are now (1905) no Friends of any branch resident on the Island.

upon them. It was exceedingly difficult—in fact, often impossible—to procure free labor, especially in the country districts. In these same localities manual labor was by a false public sentiment considered degrading, so that those who from conscientious grounds had to do such work themselves were obliged to take a lower position in society than the one to which they really belonged. Their well known principles placed increasing difficulties in their way in business, and also rendered them objects of suspicion to their slaveholding neighbors, who resented their opposition to the "peculiar institution," and often suspected them of aiding negroes to escape—a suspicion far better founded as regards Friends north of Mason and Dixon's line than south of it. To the Friends living in such an uncongenial atmosphere the free West appeared as a land of promise, and a steady exodus soon set in. The Friends from this cause died out in South Carolina, and were so greatly reduced in number in Virginia that in 1845 Virginia Yearly Meeting was suspended and joined to Baltimore Yearly Meeting. This latter body, small to begin with (after the separation), had also suffered from the same cause, so that the two joined were still the smallest Yearly Meeting in the world. The same state of things existed in North Carolina, and at one time it seemed as if there were risk of that Yearly Meeting being lost. Sometimes whole congregations would emigrate in a body, so that one instance has been known

where the same church organization remained in force, the same officers continuing to act in the new settlement as they had done in the old home.[1]

Another cause of the diminution in numbers was the strict enforcement of the Discipline and prompt disownment of members for what in this day seem comparatively slight offenses. To marry a non-member, or to make use of any other religious marriage ceremony than that of Friends, was a disownable offense on the ground that it recognized what was called, in the rather severe language of the Society in that day, a "hireling" ministry.[2] Many other things that would now be esteemed trivial, but which had had, at the beginning at least, a foundation in some principle that was deemed important, were made the cause for expulsion from the Soccety. That the denomination should have lived at all through such restrictions, especially as it was not thought right to use any efforts to obtain new members, is a striking evidence of the power that was in the body. Increase of spiritual life would at first tend to increase the activity in the support of the Discipline, till as the life grew the power that was present gradually caused unneeessary restrictions to be laid aside and others to be modified.

Still another cause of decline in numbers was

[1] S. B. Weeks, "Southern Quakers and Slavery," Baltimore 1896.

[2] Civil ceremonies were also offences against the Discipline.

that there were for many greater attractions in a life of more conformity with the ways of ordinary persons, so that not a few left from their own free will. Again, the position of Friends on a variety of subjects of doctrine and practice was so unlike that of the other denominations about them that it required the courage of one's convictions to withstand the weight of public opinion. When all these reasons are taken into consideration, the wonder is that so many remained, and not that there was a decline.

The picture presented in the West during this period was in several respects very different. While the East was losing by emigration, the West was gaining. The meetings in Ohio, Indiana, and Iowa soon became large and flourishing. For a long time fully as great strictness prevailed as in the East, and there was the same readiness to "disown," but the circumstances were different. The country was new and thinly settled at first, and there were fewer temptations to worldliness. Again, the Friends settled largely in communities, so that in many cases they would form the bulk of the population, and in this way public opinion would be with them. Their growth was large, and new Yearly Meetings were set up. Ohio had been set off in 1812 from Baltimore; Indiana from Ohio in 1821. In 1858 Western (comprising western and northern portions of Indiana, and eastern Illinois) was set off; Iowa in 1863, and Kansas in 1872. All these were

established from Indiana Yearly Meeting, which also set off Wilmington Yearly Meeting of southwestern Ohio, in 1892. Iowa Yearly Meeting in 1893 set off the Yearly Meeting of Oregon, and in 1895 California. About two thirds of all the Friends in the world are in the United States west of the Alleghanies.

It must not be concluded that the decrease in membership in the East continued. After 1865 a new life appeared there also, especially in New York and New England where the decrease stopped and an increase is noted, especially in the former. North Carolina also about trebled its membership, and Baltimore nearly doubled. This has been notwithstanding the continual loss through emigration, and the fact of a low birth-rate.

In 1867 Canada Yearly Meeting was set off from New York. It was considered an interesting fact that during the time of the holding of its first session the "Dominion of Canada" was inaugurated.[1]

Great changes have taken place since the tide has turned, and Friends became an aggressive, growing body, instead of a diminishing one. The old peculiar cut of dress and the "plain" language of "thee" and "thou" have been discarded,

[1] Settlement of Friends in Canada were made from Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York during the latter part of the eighteenth century. For a time under the care both of Philadelphia and of New York Yearly Meetings, they were finally joined to the latter, with which they were incorporated until 1867. Some Friends near the New York line were retained when those of the Canadian meetings were set off.

as having no religious value for the present age.[1] The numerical names for months and days are still almost universally used by Friends in their official language and in their records, but the practice of using them in ordinary conversation is rapidly dying out.

There has also been a considerable relaxation in the Discipline. Many old rules have been either annulled or allowed to become a dead letter. In this change there may be a question whether there is not a risk of going to the other extreme, but nevertheless there is a great deal of care in respect to daily living. But the attitude of the meeting and its officers has long ceased to be one of judging with a view to cutting off the offender, and is now one of encouragement toward the weak and the restoration of those who are astray. As soon as this feeling became general the rapid decline in numbers ceased.

Friends during the thirty years succeeding the separation of 1828 reawakened to the fact that one of the main duties of the Christian Church is to carry the gospel to those who do not know it. Almost every Yearly Meeting is pervaded with the sense that this is the great object toward which every avenue of work is to contribute.

[1] Not a few continue to use the "thee" and the "thou" in their families and to their intimate Friends, partly for old association and partly in the way the French and Germans do, as a sign of the familiarity of friendship. Philadelphia Yearly Meeting continues to lay considerable stress on the old form of dress and address, and until a very recent date declined to record as a minister any one who did not wear "plain dress."

Everything is now chiefly judged from the simple point of view as to whether it will tend to the spread to the knowledge of Jesus Christ and the building up of believers. From being one of the most traditional of all bodies Friends have come to believe that an essential characteristic of Quakerism is freedom, and so traditionalism is now with many one of their greatest fears. The simplicity of their organization, the freedom in their meetings for worship to any one to take vocal part under what is felt to be the guidance of the Spirit, each one being subject to the judgment of the rest, allows flexibility and variety of service and the development of individual gifts. In not a few instances their freedom from an established order of clergy has been found to be the means of inspiring confidence. The practice of silent united worship as the basis upon which meetings are held, where it is appreciated, tends to cause the worshiper to seek the Lord directly, and thus strengthens religious character.

The change of front was truly marvelous, and on the whole was accomplished with very little friction. A number of prominent ministers and others in the latter years of the nineteenth century sought to change the position of the Friends on the subject of baptism and the Supper. This was especially the case in Ohio, which Yearly Meeting in 1886 refused to make the subject in any way a test matter. All the other Orthodox Yearly Meetings, took prompt action, declaring it

incompatible for any one who observed these ordinances or advocated the use of them to remain in the position of minister or elder. This rule was not strictly enforced, but the general sentiment of the Society supported it, and the matter soon ceased to be a burning question.

A general conference of Friends (Orthodox), for the purpose of taking into consideration matters of general interest to the body at large, was suggested in Indiana Yearly Meeting, 1886, and a proposition that such a conference should be held at Richmond, Indiana, in 1887 was sent by that Yearly Meeting to all the Orthodox Yearly Meetings in the United States and Canada, and also to London and Dublin Yearly Meetings. The proposition was agreed to by all the yearly meetings, except Philadelphia,[1] and delegates were appointed. The conference met as proposed, Tenth month, 1887, it was the first of its kind, no other conference having had delegates from both Europe and America.[2] It lasted for three days and accomplished a vast amount of work. The most important of its actions were the issuing of a "Declaration of Faith" and the suggestions for a stated conference to be held regular intervals. The "Declaration" consisted largely of extracts from standard writings, and is too diffuse and general in its statements to be regarded as a rigid

[1] Philadelphia did not consider the question.

[2] Philadelphia was unofficially represented, several Friends belonging to that yearly meeting having been invited to participate in the discussions but not in reaching conclusions.

creed; nevertheless, it much more nearly approaches one than any of the Declarations that have preceded it. It conforms much more nearly to the standards of ordinary evangelical denominations. As might have been expected from the fact that baptism and the Supper were the questions then at issue, the space occupied in the consideration of these topics is disproportionately large. While it acknowledges the distinguishing views of Friends of the universality of the operation of the Spirit of Christ, it tends to pass them over. It states the Quaker doctrine of peace, and against oaths, etc., clearly and well; states in guarded language the doctrines of future rewards and punishments; and reaffirms the deity of Christ and salvation through him. The "Declaration" met with strong opposition in England, and London Yearly Meeting took no action on the document except to place it on its Minutes as part of the report of its committee. New England and Ohio took essentially the same position as London. Dublin, New York, and Baltimore gave a general approval of it without adopting it. The other (Orthodox) Yearly Meetings in the United States adopted it. This variety of action in no way altered the official relations of the Yearly Meetings, for the action of the conference was only advisory and not authoritative.

After this the subject of baptism and the Supper became of secondary interest and was overshadowed by that of the ministry. With the in-

crease of religious life and evangelizing zeal not only had old congregations taken on new growth and activity, but many new congregations had been formed. To accomplish this many methods formerly unknown among Friends were in various places brought into use, such as congregational singing, and the employment of methods more or less similar to those so common among the Methodists. Persons brought rapidly into the Society and with very little knowledge of the methods of Friends or instruction in them were found not to understand their unconventional ways. With the intense zeal for new converts that had now taken hold of the Society, it often seemed simpler to adapt the meetings to the crude ideas of the converts rather than to follow the slower process of educating them; and in this way in many places in the West and some in the East very decided changes began to show themselves. Most noticeable of these was the introduction of "pastors," who at first were expected to give their whole time to looking after the congregation, and preaching, but not in any way to the exclusion of the rest, or even necessarily always to preach. In order to enable them to do this a very slight support was afforded them. This change came very quietly, and the system became general in the Yearly Meetings west of the Alleghanies, though there are some individual exceptions. There is at present none of it in Philadelphia and Baltimore, and but little in North Carolina and New

England. It has given rise to much discussion, generally carried on in a very Christian spirit. It should be said, however, that there are very few meetings where there is not some opportunity for those who feel called upon to perform vocal service, or to exercise their gifts.[1]

The Richmond Conference of 1887 had suggested that a similar conference should be held every five years; Kansas Yearly Meeting in 1887 had suggested a general conference with legislative powers and a uniform discipline for all the yearly meetings, but this was not accepted by the other yearly meetings. Finally, in 1891 "delegates from committees of various yearly meetings appointed to consider and report upon the subject of organizing a Conference of Yearly Meetings of Friends in America" met in Oskaloosa, Iowa. After careful consideration it was decided to propose "that provided six yearly meetings, or a smaller number containing in the aggregate two-thirds of the membership of Friends in America, unite in the concern, such a conference be held every five years; and that the first one be held in 1892." All arrangements were left to a committee which was to take action in case a sufficient number of yearly meetings responded.[2]

[1] Where the "Pastoral System" prevails, the meetings of the Christian Endeavor Society, to a very large extent, take the place of the meeting for worship as a training school for those called to the ministry.

[2] "Report of the Associate Committees of the Yearly Meetings on the subject of a Conference, etc., Oskaloosa, Iowa, 1891."

This proposition was forwarded by the committee to all the American Yearly Meetings (Orthodox), and after careful consideration was agreed to by all except Canada and Philadelphia[1] yet not fully as to details, most of the Yearly Meetings not considering themselves bound to continue to send delegates to future conferences unless it seemed best. Baltimore instructed its delegates not to take part in voting in case any question should be settled in that way.[2]

The conference was held in Tenth month, 1892, at Indianapolis, Indiana, and was unlike any that preceded it in the fact that the representation to it was in proportion to the membership of the respective Yearly Meetings,[3] and unlike the one of 1887 in having no representatives from Great Britain, Ireland, or Canada. There were 106 delegates present. In this conference the great question was that of "pastoral labor," and a minute on the subject was adopted. The delegates from Baltimore, most of those from North Carolina, and a number from Kansas objected to the minute on the ground of its indorsement of the appointment of pastors, which they felt was a serious interference with the true liberty of the membership at large, with spiritual worship, and the

[1] Philadelphia, it should be said, did not consider the matter.

[2] As a matter of fact, no question was decided by vote during the conference.

[3] "Each Yearly Meeting should be entitled to five delegates at large and one additional delegate for every one thousand members or fraction thereof exceeding five hundred."

development of strong Christian character. In the course of the discussion it was stated without contradiction that it placed the ministry on a financial basis and meant a professional class and theological seminaries, etc., and also the placing of meetings for worship under one man to the exclusion of others who might feel a call to preach or to exercise spiritual gifts or calls. These statements attracted much attention and comment, and exercised a restraining influence on not a few.

The conference adopted the plan of organization proposed by the committee at Oskaloosa (1891), and appointed a committee consisting of one from each delegation present to make the necessary arrangements for a conference in 1897.[1]

In the field of evangelization Friends have been most successful, especially in the West. Their work by no means has been confined to their own denomination, but they have gladly labored for others and in union with other denominations. Although they have become a proselyting body, they are still remarkable for their freedom from jealousy of others and readiness to encourage converts to join whatever denomination of Christians they may feel will be most helpful to them.

Increasing attention is being paid to education and to the spreading of the doctrines of Friends

[1] This committee was "authorized to add to its own number representatives of other Yearly Meetings if any should desire to unite."

and to building up of consistent character. Probably at no time since the first founders of the Society passed away has there been such general healthful Christian experience in the Society, so much zeal, and so much growth. In every Monthly Meeting there is a Pastoral committee and in meetings where there is a Pastor this committee cooperates with him.

Foreign Missions.

With increased interest in home work the interest in the foreign field has also been aroused. Though in the earlier part of their history Friends were foremost in this work, during the next century their activity in this line of labor almost ceased. Early in the nineteenth century, such men as James Backhouse and George Washington Walker, of England, and later Daniel Wheeler, undertook long and important journeys in Africa, Australia, and the South Sea Islands. Toward the middle of the century Eli and Sybil Jones, of Maine, both of them ministers of remarkable power, visited Africa, and in 1865, Syria. They were the means of starting a mission on Mount Lebanon, and one at Ramallah, not very far from Jerusalem. The former is now under the care of English Friends, who were much earlier in the field of systematic mission work than American Friends, and the latter is under the care of New England Yearly Meeting aided by other Yearly Meetings. The work of foreign missions has ex-

tended, and now nearly all the Yearly Meetings have special committees on the subject, and in addition to this there has been formed the Woman's Foreign Missionary Union of Friends, which is an active body having branches in most of the Yearly Meetings. The conference of 1892 proposed the establishment of a central Board of Foreign Missions, whose duties should be to give information and promote unity of action on the part of the different Yearly Meetings, rather than to act as a controlling force. A sufficient number of Yearly Meetings agreed to this and the American Friends Board of Foreign Missions was established in 1894.

Lack of space forbids even a *résumé* of the missions of this period, but in Japan, Syria, Mexico, and Alaska were flourishing mission stations, while to the missions of the English Friends in Syria, China, India, and Madagascar substantial aid was extended, and individuals went to the Congo State and elsewhere. A monthly paper, called the "Friends' Missionary Advocate," was established. In addition to this many Friends were much interested in the McCall missions in France.

The Orthodox Friends are the only ones who are engaged in organized foreign mission work.

CHAPTER VIII.

LATEST YEARS.

(1894–1905.)

ONE of the most important events in the history of the Friends during the decade ending 1905, was the "American Friends Peace Conference" held in Philadelphia, December 12–14, 1901. This is the first time since 1827 that all in America calling themselves Friends came together under that name on a common platform, and united in a common effort toward an end in which all were interested.

The idea arose in the Seventh Annual Conference on International Arbitration at Lake Mohonk, New York, 1901. It was felt by the Friends who attended that conference "that the opening year of the Twentieth Century ought not to be allowed to pass without some general manifestation, on the part of all in America who call themselves and are known as Friends, of their peace principles and faith."[1] The conference was held as stated above. The program consisted of carefully prepared papers on various phases of the peace question, with a limited time given to

[1] See "American Friends Peace Conference, etc., 1901. Philadelphia, 1902. Published by the Conference."

general discussion. The meetings were largely attended and were interesting throughout, and there was no inharmonious note.

"PRIMITIVE" FRIENDS.

There has been little to note in the history of those called "Primitive," or, as they like to be called, "Conservative" Friends. They have continued in their quiet unaggressive course. As no official statistics are taken, it is impossible to make accurate statements as to their number; estimates vary from two hundred to two hundred and fifty, but the former is probably nearer the actual membership.

They have General and Quarterly Meetings, which are independent of each other, and are practically Yearly Meetings, as once a year each meeting considers such subjects as would normally come before a Yearly Meeting. Epistles are exchanged "as way opens for it," but usually every year. The Discipline followed is that of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, as revised and adopted in 1834. Unless some change should occur, this faithful little body must die out, for there are few accessions and the losses by death greatly exceed the gains by birth.[1]

[1] Their meetings are: Scipio Quarterly Meeting of Friends, comprising Poplar Ridge, and Ulysses, New York; Quarterly Meeting of Friends for New England, comprising Providence and Centredale, Rhode Island, and Lynn, Massachusetts; and General Meeting of Friends for Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, etc. (Meetings at Philadelphia, Bristol, and Fallsington, Pennsylvania.)

"WILBURITES."

As with the "Primitive" Friends, there has been little to note in the history of this branch. As with the "Primitive" Friends also, few accessions and a low birth rate have prevented the increase in membership, and the decline in numbers has been steady. How great this has been it is impossible to say, as no statistics are taken; but the loss since the government census of 1890 can scarcely be less than ten per cent, and is probably more. This would make the membership about 3900.[1] In some of the western yearly meetings, where the birth-rate is higher, it is possible that the meetings have held their own, but the decline in the East has been great.

The most interesting event in their later history is the establishment of a new Yearly Meeting in North Carolina. The membership consists almost wholly of Friends living in the eastern part of the State who separated from North Carolina Yearly Meeting (Orthodox). These Friends were disturbed by the introduction into North Carolina Yearly Meeting of some of the so-called "Western methods." The troubles came to a head when the Yearly Meeting adopted the "Constitution and Discipline." This was made the occasion of the separation. Great efforts were made by the Yearly Meeting to avoid a division, but the dissatisfied ones, taking prac-

[1] With the new North Carolina Yearly Meeting about 4150.

tically the same ground as those who had separated in Western, Kansas, and Iowa Yearly Meetings, held on their course and set up a new Yearly Meeting in 1904.

In their defence they say that they have "met in Yearly Meeting capacity, in the love of God, under a deep religious concern, that Friends in this and other sections, who are spiritually oppressed by the many changes that have taken place in the Society of Friends at large, and who desire to uphold and maintain the doctrines and practices of the Christian religion in accordance with Early Friends, may be free to do so." They desire "individual faithfulness to that waiting, spiritual worship wherein direct communion with the Father and with the Son, through the Holy Spirit, is to be known, and a fresh anointing given by Him for every work and service in His church, whether it be in preaching, prayer, or praise." They go on to emphasize the priesthood of believers, and the freedom from all forms and ceremonies; they believe "that no other than a free gospel ministry can fully accord with the teaching of our Lord and Saviour"; and they "plead for that liberty of conscience in individual believers for which our Early Friends suffered severe persecution, and even martyrdom, and which has been of such great blessing to humanity."

This meeting has addressed epistles to the "Wilburite" bodies, and, so far as known, has been

recognized by them. The number of separatists is between two hundred and three hundred, and they are confined chiefly to one quarterly meeting.[1]

THE "HICKSITES."

The renewal of life among the "Hicksites" noticed in the preceding chapter has continued. The Committees on Philanthropic Labor have been especially active in carrying out the purposes for which they were established, which, as the name implies, are philanthropic rather than religious.[2]

The most potent influence, however, has been the Biennial Conference. These conferences are a development from the First-Day School Conferences, which, begun in 1868, were held annually at various centres with the exception of 1877, until 1879, from which date they have been held in alternate years. "Friends Union for Philanthropic Labor" was organized in Waynesville, Ohio, in 1882, and after 1883 the First-Day School and Philanthropic Conferences have been held at the same times and places. In 1896 an Educational department was organized, in 1894 sub-

[1] See "Minutes of North Carolina Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1904," pages 37–40. "Minutes of North Carolina Yearly Meeting of Friends held at Cedar Grove, Northampton County, North Carolina, 1904." [Separatists.]

[2] The fields of labor are: "Mission work among Women and Children, Peace, Gambling, and kindred vices, Abolition of the death penalty, Purity, Improper publications, Temperance, Tobacco, Indian affairs, Prison reform, Equal rights for women, Work among the colored people."

jects of a definite religious character were added, and since 1902 the four hitherto partially distinct Conferences were merged into one General Conference to be held biennially, in which the Young Friends Associations were also represented." It will be seen that the conference "was a matter of development. It began with the conscious need of better applied methods for carrying on the work connected with one of the activities, and naturally expanded to meet the increasing needs." [1]

These conferences have brought out clearly the community of interest which belongs to Friends, have offered the opportunity for exchange of views, have widened the personal acquaintance of Friends, and have strengthened in every way the efforts made along religious, philanthropic, and educational lines.[2]

Two direct results of the conferences should be noted: First, the appointment of a joint committee on Educational Interests, which takes into consideration the educational needs and opportunities of the whole field; secondly, the appointment of a committee on the Advancement of Friends' Principles. This committee was first appointed in 1902 and has since been actively em-

[1] Introduction "Proceedings of Friends General Conference Chautauqua, New York, 1900. Philadelphia, 1900," page iii.

[2] There is no uniform method employed in appointing delegates to these conferences; in some Yearly Meetings they are chosen by the yearly meeting, in others by the committee on Philanthropic Labor. The conferences are only advisory and have no disciplinary or legislative authority.

ployed in fulfilling the objects of its establishment. These are, visiting and encouraging the weaker meetings, and indeed all who wish aid; providing for lectures on the principles and doctrines of Friends; and circulating books and other literature relating to Friends.[1] Another work of this committee has been the establishment of a First-Day School Assembly at Buck Hill Falls, Pennsylvania, where there is a summer settlement of Friends. This assembly is held during the summer, and "the subjects discussed are, Methods of Primary Work, the History and Teaching of Friends, Aims and Methods—the last dealing especially with the psychological side of religious teaching and the appropriate use of the Bible in such teaching."

Still another and important outgrowth of the conferences is the "Joint Committee of the Seven Yearly Meetings for work among Isolated Members." Meetings of this committee are held annually at different places. Through a salaried secretary at the central office in Philadelphia, isolated members all over the country are corresponded with, their addresses kept on file, and where there are enough Friends in one place these are encouraged to form associations and hold meetings for worship.

An interesting feature of the Young Friends Associations has been the courses of lectures given

[1] The expenses of this committee including the salary of the Secretary, so far, have been met by voluntary subscriptions.

under their auspices. These have been on Theological and Biblical subjects, such as Bible History, Doctrines, their History and Development, etc. The lecturers have not been confined to Friends, but specialists from other denominations have been invited to lecture from time to time.

Another pleasant feature has been the readiness to join in fellowship, as far as practicable, with all who bear the name of Friends.[1]

Not since 1828 has there been so much life and interest shown or such activity in searching after truth and knowledge as at present. This interest, however, has been manifested almost wholly within the body, as there have been few if any direct efforts in the direction of increasing the membership.

In this as in the smaller branches, there has been a steady decline in numbers. So far as statistics are available a loss of about twelve hundred members is shown since 1890. This is a serious outlook, though not peculiar, for it is true of all branches of Friends that accessions from outside are essential, not only for an increase of numbers, but to prevent absolute decline. (See Appendix for statistics.)

[1] This is shown in many ways; as by inviting members of the Orthodox body to take part in anniversary exercises, to give addresses and lectures at conferences and on other occasions, and also by the unofficial message of brotherly greeting sent through an individual by their New York Yearly Meeting, 1905, to London Yearly Meeting (then in session), and responded to in like manner. See Friends "Intelligencer," vol. 62, 6 mo. 3, p. 338, 6 mo. 10, p. 355, 6 mo. 24, p. 390. The (London) Friend, vol. 45, 6 mo. 9, p. 371.

ORTHODOX.

In accordance with the instructions of the Conference of 1892, the executive committee fixed Tenth month, 19, 1897, as the date for opening the Third Quinquennial Conference of Friends in America, and Indianapolis, Indiana, as the place of meeting.

The Conference met as appointed, with 129 delegates present from all the American Yearly Meetings (Orthodox), except Philadelphia.[1] Unlike the previous conferences, there was a definite pre-arranged program, and the discussions were opened by thoughtful addresses or papers, which were followed by free but courteous discussion.

While the old fundamental principles and doctrines of Quakerism were reaffirmed, there was a strong feeling, but slightly tempered with conservatism, that, if needful, old methods and even some doctrines, must give place to new, in order to meet present issues and to solve present problems. The work and qualification of the ministry was a subject specially considered, and on it the conference formulated its conclusions at length, and in general sympathy with what is called the "pastoral movement." A rather colorless declaration regarding the "Higher Criticism" was also adopted, in addition to others on matters of general interest.

Perhaps the most important subjects before

[1] Philadelphia, as before, did not consider the matter.

the conference were those of a closer union of the Yearly Meetings, and a uniform Discipline.[1] These were fully discussed, and the conclusion reached that both were desirable. A committee of two from each yearly meeting taking part in the conference was appointed to formulate a plan of union, and prepare a uniform discipline to be submitted to the yearly meetings for their approval, both to become operative when adopted by such a number as might be agreed upon. This number was afterwards fixed by the committee at seven. The character of this union and the Discipline have already been considered in the Introduction to this volume. (See pages 22–24).

As the adoption of the plan of union and of a uniform Discipline was problematical, the conference of 1897 provided for the meeting of a Fourth Quinquennial Conference in 1902. Delegates to this were appointed by the same Yearly Meetings as were represented in the preceding conference. The conference met in Indianapolis Tenth month 21, 1902. One session only was held, at which the new Discipline, known as "The Constitution and Discipline for the American Yearly Meetings of Friends," was received, and with it the report of the committee by which it was prepared, stating that eleven yearly meetings had accepted the plan of union, adopted the

[1] Direct communications suggesting and supporting some such action were received by the Conference from Indiana, Wilmington, Western, and Kansas Yearly Meetings.

new Discipline, and had appointed delegates[1] to the new Five-Years Meeting, which would take the place of the conference. After the acceptance of the report, and the transaction of some formal concluding business, the conference adjourned without day.

The first Five-Years Meeting met the next day, Tenth month 22, 1902, with 137 delegates from all the American (Orthodox) Yearly Meetings except Philadelphia, Canada, and Ohio, the last two, however, sent fraternal delegates, who were invited to take part in the discussions, but were not appointed on committees or given a vote.[2] The delegates were appointed under the rule laid down in the Constitution and Discipline, which was the same as that followed in the Conference of 1892 and 1897.[3] The proceedings were transacted under the rules of parliamentary usage.

The sessions were marked by great interest. Considerable time was taken up in organizing the work of the Five-Years Meeting and discussing its functions. The papers were timely and suggestive, and the discussions lively and generally helpful.

The Meeting, in accordance with the new Dis-

[1] The delegates to the Five-Years Meeting and to the Conference were with slight exception the same individuals.

[2] Canada adopted the Discipline in 1900, but reconsidered the subject in 1901 and rejected it as not suited to their condition. Ohio rejected it on the ground that it was not definite enough on points of doctrine. Philadelphia did not consider it.

[3] See page 202, Note, also Constitution and Discipline, Part II, chap. xiii.

cipline, appointed an Evangelistic and Church Extension Board, one on Education, one on Legislation, and one on the Condition and Welfare of the Negroes; it adopted as its official representative on the respective subjects, the American Friends Board of Foreign Missions, the Associated Executive Committee on Indian Affairs, and The Peace Association of Friends in America. After some discussion a committee was appointed to invite the different church organizations in America to unite in holding a general conference in 1906 on the subject of How to Prevent the evils arising from the Liquor Traffic, and to make arrangements for holding such a conference if a sufficient number of the church organizations should unite in the effort.

There was no discussion relative to the "pastoral" question, the fact of the general adoption of the system in some shape by most of the yearly meetings, being taken for granted. There was an evident desire on the part of the great majority of the delegates to find subjects upon which there would be agreement rather than difference, and the spirit of the meeting was more conservative than that of the Conference of 1897.

It is still too early to speak decidedly regarding the effect of the union just described. The following judgment, published soon after the adjournment of the Meeting, doubtless expresses the feelings of many :—"The Five-Years Meeting held at Indianapolis, last month, marks an era in

the history of Orthodox Friends in America. The great body of the Society was then welded into an organization by the adoption of the "Uniform Discipline," that has brought the Yearly Meetings into one organic body in a sense that has never before been realized. It is a movement which, while fraught with possibilities of evil and of good, is to be regarded with hope. . . . As to the general influence of the Five-Years Meeting, just held, there can be no doubt that it tended to unite Friends from the different sections, and to bring them to a better understanding of one another. That there are very important differences no one can deny, and in some places changes have been introduced which seem inconsistent with the fundamental position of Friends. At the same time it was perfectly clear that the Five Years Meeting was composed of persons who had the true Friendly spirit. Compared with the attitude of the similar gathering ten years ago at the same place, there was shown a distinctly greater love of Friends and their principles, and there is a revival of interest in the study of their history.[1]

It is also too soon to estimate the value of the work of the Five-Years Meeting planned to be carried on through its "Boards." One or two of these boards, perhaps, indicate what the Meeting

[1] "Richard H. Thomas, M.D., Life and Letters, London and Philadelphia, 1905," pp. 376, 377 (quoted from "The Interchange," Eleventh month, 1902.)

felt should be objects of interest rather than interest itself.

The American Friends Board of Foreign Missions has done comparatively little in the field of "general advisory oversight,"[1] but has given most of its attention to mission work in Cuba, the results of which have been very encouraging.

Largely through the efforts of the Board on Legislation the United States Congress has passed an amendment to the National Militia Law which exempts from militia duty Friends, and others who hold similar views in regard to war. This work alone justifies the appointment of the Board.[2]

So far as known, the Boards on the welfare and condition of the Negro, and on Evangelistic and Church extension work, have done little except to endeavor to get an accurate survey of their fields of service.

A very successful Educational Conference was held under the auspices of the Board on Education at Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana, July 31 to August 3, 1905. The conference was

[1] This was inevitable, the Yearly Meetings being unwilling to turn over their individual work to the Board.

[2] Amendment to House, Bill 15,345, Fifty-seventh Congress, 2nd Sess.—"Provided that nothing in this act shall be construed to require or compel any member of any well-recognized religious sect or organization at present organized and existing, whose creed forbids its members to participate in war in any form, and whose religious convictions are against war or participation therein, in accordance with the creed of said religious organization, to serve in the militia or any other armed or volunteer force under the jurisdiction of and authority of the United States." Congressional Record, vol. 36, page 780, January 14, 1903.

attended by delegates from various yearly meetings, and representatives of almost every school and college of importance belonging to the Friends (Orthodox) in America. The exercises consisted of carefully prepared papers followed by discussion.

General conferences on Education similar to this, beginning with that at Baltimore in 1877, have been held at Haverford College, Earlham College, Penn College, Oskaloosa, Iowa, and at Providence, Rhode Island. The intervals between the conferences have been about five years. The interchange of opinion and the comprehensive view obtained of the educational situation, have been of great benefit to the cause of education among Friends.

During the past decade Foreign Mission work as shown by the annual reports to the Yearly Meetings and the reports of the American Friends Board of Foreign Missions, has been prosecuted with continued zeal and success. Beside this work, independent or semi-independent missions have been carried on in East Africa, and in Cuba, and perhaps elsewhere.[2] [See Appendix.]

Interest in Home Mission work has been un-

[1] The subjects discussed fell under the following heads :— "The Educational Situation; The Articulation of our Educational Agencies; The School and Society; The School and the Church; and Our Educational Ideals."

[2] See Minutes of the various Yearly Meetings; "Present Condition of the Foreign Mission Work of American Friends." Mahalah Joy, Proceedings of the Five-Years Meeting, 1902, also published separately; Annual Reports of the American Friends Board of Foreign Missions, 1895–1905.

abated. In efforts to lessen the evils arising from the Liquor Traffic, and in the effort to suppress the traffic altogether, Friends as individuals, and as yearly meetings, have been active. Altogether, there has been probably no time when Friends have been more successful in practical work; particularly that outside their own borders.

In June, 1900, the first American Friends, (Orthodox) Summer School of Religious History, was held at Haverford College, Haverford, Pennsylvania. The spacious and beautiful grounds, the halls of residence, the convenient lecture and class-rooms, the well furnished Library, all lent their aid to make the experiment a great success. The lectures were fresh and stimulating, and while a few were grieved at some of the statements made, most persons were helped and widened in their thoughts.[1] A second Summer School equally successful, was held, again at Haverford, in 1904. This second school especially, was pervaded by a deep religious spirit. At each school about seven hundred individuals registered as attending one or more lectures.

The present condition of the Orthodox Friends has been sufficiently indicated in the preceding pages. It might, however, be noted that the rate of annual increase in membership has not kept pace with that of the earlier years of the past

[1] The lecturers were by no means confined to Friends, for the list included such men as Professor George F. Moore of Harvard University, Professor William N. Clarke, Professor Robert W. Rogers, Washington Gladden of Columbus, Ohio, and others.

decade.[1] To what this comparative halt is due, is not easy to discover. It is enough to say that the condition is not peculiar to Friends, but is to be found in other branches of the Christian Church.

In this brief history it will have been seen that the Friends acquired, through much suffering, first toleration, and then freedom both in civil and religious matters, not only for themselves, but for all men. Some have thought that their mission is ended, but there still seems to be need of them to emphasize the Christian Doctrine of Peace, the non-essentiality of ordinance and ritual, the spirituality of true worship, the reality of the direct communication of the will of God to the individual, and the priesthood of all believers.

[1] See Statistics, p. 225.

STATISTICS.

STATISTICS OF MEMBERSHIP, UNITED STATES CENSUS, 1890.

Friends (Orthodox)	80655
" (Hicksite)	21992
" (Wilburite)	4329
" (Primitive)	232
Total	107,208

STATISTICS. 1904.

ORTHODOX.

YEARLY MEETINGS.	1896	1898	1900	1902	1904
Philadelphia	4450[1]	4200[1]	4468	4400[1]	4441
New York	3757	3897	3756	3545	3339
New England	4502	4499	4503	4462	4415
California	1359	1506	1510	1710	2046
Oregon	1566	1489	1553	1607	1635
Canada	1034	1076	1030	1075	1122
North Carolina	5454	5244	5456	5194	5619
Wilmington (O.)	5207	5865	6089	6273	6291
Ohio	5009	5229	5773	5809	5577
Iowa	11124	11274	10865	11280	11135
Western	15091	16100	15868	15196	14347
Indiana[2]	19510	20393	20144	19878	20049
Kansas	10848	11301	10869	11214	11094
Baltimore	1125	1226	1214	1203	1155
Totals	90036	93299	93098	92846	92265
Increase		3263			
Decrease			201	252	581

[1] Estimated.

[2] 400 are deducted from totals, being estimated number of "Mission Members" in Mexico. For 1904, 560 are deducted. See Minutes of Indiana Yearly Meeting 1896 to 1904.

MEMBERS IN FOREIGN MISSION FIELDS[1] UNDER THE CARE OF AMERICAN FRIENDS, 1904.

Alaska	Oregon.....Yearly Meeting.	60
Alaska	Kansas..... " " .	170
Alaska, Kotzebue	California..... " " .	560
Mexico	Indiana..... " " .	560
Mexico	Western..... " " .	240
Cuba	Amer. Friends Board For. Miss.	120
Jamaica	Iowa.....Yearly Meeting.	651
Palestine, Ramallah	New England.. " " .	40
China and India	Ohio..... " " .	169
Japan[2]	Philadelphia..Friends.....	335
Total		2905

FRIENDS IN EUROPE AND ELSEWHERE.

	1896	1898	1900	1902	1904
London Yearly Meeting	16476	16854	17153	17476	18221
Dublin " "	2610	2592	2609	2528	2511
Continental Europe, etc[3]	267	237	249	247	248
Australasia	510	495	497	550	809
Africa[3]					110
Totals	19863	20178	20508	20801	21890

[1] Estimated.

[2] This mission is not connected with the Yearly Meeting, but is carried on by an organization composed of Philadelphia Friends.

[3] Estimated.

MEMBERSHIP IN FOREIGN MISSION FIELDS.[1]

1904.

Madagascar	2555
India	211
Syria	36
China	60
Total	2862

"HICKSITE."[2]

YEARLY MEETINGS.

Philadelphia[3]	1900	11482
New York[4]	1900	2389
Baltimore	1900	2955
Genesee[5]	1890	1535
Indiana	1899	1536
Illinois	1899	1059
Ohio (estimated)	1900	400
Total		21356

"WILBURITE" AND "PRIMITIVE."

No Statistics appear to have been gathered since the United States Census of 1890.

RECAPITULATION.

Friends (Orthodox) America (1904)	92265		
"Hicksite" " (1900)	21356		
"Wilburite" " (1890)	4329		
"Primitive" " (1890)	232		118182
Great Britain, Ireland, etc. (1904)	21890		21890
			140072
Foreign Mission Fields under the care of American Friends (1904)	2905		
Foreign Mission Fields under the care of London Yearly Meeting (1904)	2862		5767
Total			145839

[1] Estimated.
[2] Taken from Friends' Almanac, 1902, p. 91.
[3] Number in 1905, 11107 ("Friends' Intelligencer.")
[4] Number in 1905, 2256 ("Friends' Intelligencer.")
[5] Including the few Friends in Canada.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

OF THE MORE IMPORTANT WORKS CONSULTED.

I. Bibliographies, and Manuscript Collections dating from the Seventeenth Century.

Smith, Joseph, *Descriptive Catalogue of Friends' Books.* Two vols. London, Joseph Smith, 1867 ; Supplement, London, Edward Hicks, Jr., 1893.

Smith, Joseph, *Bibliotheca Anti-Quakeriana : A Catalogue of Books Adverse to the Society of Friends.* London, Joseph Smith, 1873.

Manuscript Collections :

The London Yearly Meeting, in its Library, Devonshire House, 12 Bishopsgate Street Without, London, England, has an unrivaled collection of manuscripts illustrating the early history of the Society. The Swarthmoor papers are often indorsed in George Fox's handwriting. The official records are very complete, reaching from the seventeenth century to the present time.

Records relating to New England are at Sandwich and New Bedford, Mass., and at The Moses Brown School, Providence, R. I. The Records relating to New York are somewhat scattered, though many of great value are in the Meeting House on Twentieth Street, and in that on Rutherford Place, New York City. At Friends' Library, and at the Meeting House, Fourth and Arch streets, Philadelphia, there are many records relating to Pennsylvania and New Jersey. The Records of Baltimore Yearly Meeting previous to 1828 are at the Meeting House ("Hicksite"), Baltimore, Md., where they, like those at Philadelphia, are admirably cared for ; and Records of the Orthodox Body, and the Records of Virginia Yearly Meet-

ing are in the possession of the Orthodox Friends of Baltimore, Md. The Records of North Carolina Yearly Meeting are at Guilford College, North Carolina.

Manuscript Records:

Records of Sandwich, Mass., Monthly and Quarterly Meetings beginning 1672.
Records of Virginia Yearly Meeting beginning 1673.
Records of Burlington, N. J., Monthly Meeting beginning 1678.
Records of Perquimans, N. C., Quarterly Meeting beginning 1679.

II. Printed Collections, Etc.

Connecticut, Records of, 1636–65. Edited by J. H. Trumbull. Hartford, Brown & Parsons, 1850.

**Maryland, Archives of.* Edited by Wm. Hand Browne. —*Proceedings of the Council 1636–67, 1687/8–1693; Proceedings of the Assembly 1666–76.* Baltimore, 1884–90.

**Massachusetts Bay, Records of.* Edited by N. B. Shurtleff, vols. iii.–v. Boston, 1854.

**New Jersey, State of, Documents of the Colonial History of.* Vol. i., edited by William A. Whitehead. Newark, N. J., 1880.

**New York, Documents relative to the Colonial History of.* Thirteen vols. Edited by E. B. O'Callaghan. Albany, 1856–61.

**Pennsylvania, Colonial Records.* Sixteen vols. Harrisburg, 1851–53.—*Archives.* Six vols. Philadelphia, 1852–53.—*Archives.* 2d Series, 12 vols. Harrisburg, 1874–80.

III. Printed Sources and Books Written from the the Sources.

Adams, Brooks, *The Emancipation of Massachusetts.* Boston and New York, Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1887.

Adams, Charles Francis, *Massachusetts, its Historians and its History.* Boston and New York, Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1893.

* These are State publications.

Bancroft, George, *History of the United States of America.* Six vols. Author's last Revision. New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1886.

Barclay, A. R. (Editor), *Letters, etc., of Early Friends.* London, Harvey & Darton, 1841.

Barclay, Robert (1833–1876), *The Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth Considered Principally with reference to the Influence of Church Organization on the Spread of Christianity.* London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1876; 2d ed., 1877; 3d ed., 1879. (The second and third editions are exact reprints of the first with the exception of the correction of one slight error.)

Baylie, Robert, *A Dissuasive from the Errours of the times.* London, printed for Samuel Gellibrand, 1645.

Beck, William, *The Friends.* London, Edward Hicks, Jr., 1893.

Beck, William, and **T. Frederick Ball,** *The London Friends' Meetings.* London, F. Bowyer Kitto, 1869.

Besse, Joseph, *Sufferings of the Quakers.* Two vols. London, Luke Hinde, 1753.

Bishope, George, *New-England Judged, etc.* London, 1661; reprinted 170$\frac{2}{3}$. (No publisher.)

Bowden, James, *The History of the Society of Friends in America.* Two vols. London, Alfred W. Bennett, 1850–54.

Bownas, Samuel, *An Account of the Life, Travels, etc., of.* London, Luke Hinde, 1756; 2d ed., James Phillips, 2795.

Braithwaite, Joseph Bevan, *Memoirs of Joseph John Gurney, etc.* Two vols. Philadelphia, Lippincott, Grambo & Co., 1854.

A Brief Statement of the Rise and Progress of the Testimony of the Religious Society of Friends against Slavery and the Slave Trade. Philadelphia, 1843.

Burnyeat, John, *The Truth Exalted.* London, printed for Thomas Northcott, 1691.

Comly, John, *Journal of the Life and Religious Labors of.* Philadelphia, T. Ellwood Chapman, 1853.

Croese, Gerard, *General History of the Quakers.* London, John Dunton, 1696; originally published in Latin, Amstelodami, Apud Henricum & Viduam

Theodori Boom, 1675. An abstract of the translation is in Crouch's "Posthuma Christiana."

Crouch, William, *Posthuma Christiana, or a Collection of Papers, being a brief Historical Account, etc., with Remarks on Sundry Memorable Transactions relating to the People called Quakers.* London, Assigns of J. Sowle, 1712.

Dixon, William Hepworth, *History of William Penn, Founder of Pennsylvania.* London, Chapman & Hall, 1851; 3d ed., Hurst & Blackett, 1872.

Edmundson, William, *Journal of the Life, Travels, etc., of.* Dublin, Samuel Fairbrother, 1715.

Edwards, Thomas, *The First and Second Part of Gangræna.* London, 3d ed., printed for Ralph Smith, 1646.

Ellwood, Thomas, *History of the Life of* [an Autobiography]. London, Assigns of J. Sowle, 1714. [Boston, Jas. R. Osgood & Co., 1877, and numerous other editions.

Evans, William and **Thomas,** *The Friends' Library, comprising Journals, Doctrinal Treatises, and other Writings of Members of the Religious Society of Friends.* Fourteen vols. Philadelphia, printed for the Editors by Joseph Rakestraw, 1837–50.

Exiles in Virginia, with Observations on the Conduct of the Society of Friends during the Revolutionary War, etc. Philadelphia, published for the Subscribers, 1848.

"*The First Publishers of Truth.*" Edited for the Friends' Historical Society, by Norman Penney, Parts 1 and 2, London, 1904–1905. [Still in course of publication.]

Fox, George, *A Journal or Historical Account of the Life, Travels, Sufferings, Christian Experiences, and Labour of Love in the Work of the Ministry of that Ancient, Eminent, and Faithful Servant of Jesus Christ,* GEORGE FOX, *who departed this life in great peace with the Lord, the 13th day of the 11th month, 1690.* The first volume, etc., London, Thomas Northcott, 1694. (Folio, the 1st ed., one of the earliest impressions.)

NOTE.—This volume is called "the first volume," the second being the one described in the next entry.

Fox, George, *A Collection of many Select and Christian Epistles, Letters, and Testimonies, Written on sundry Occasions by that Ancient, Eminent, Faithful Friend and Minister of Christ Jesus,* GEORGE FOX. The second volume, etc. London, J. Sowle, 1698. (Folio, the 1st ed.)

Fox, George, *Gospel Truth Demonstrated in a Collection of Doctrinal Books, Given forth by that Faithful Minister of Jesus Christ,* GEORGE FOX, *Containing* PRINCIPLES *Essential to Christianity and Salvation, held among the People called* QUAKERS, *etc.* London, J. Sowle, 1706. (Folio, the 1st ed.) (Called the third volume.)

Fox, Margaret, "Brief Collection of Remarkable Passages," etc., Relating to Margaret Fell, but by her 2nd Marriage, Margaret Fox. London, 1710.

Friends' Miscellany. Edited by John and Isaac Comly, vols. 1–12, Philadelphia, 1835–1839.

Gough, John, *History of the People called Quakers.* Four vols. Dublin, Robert Jackson, 1790.

Hallowell, Richard P., *The Pioneer Quakers.* Boston and New York, Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1887.

Hallowell, Richard P., *The Quaker Invasion of Massachusetts.* Boston and New York, Houghton, Mifflin & Co.; 1st ed., 1883; 4th ed., 1887.

Harvey, T. Edmund, *The Rise of the Quakers.* London, Headley Brothers, 1905.

Hicks, Elias, *Journal of the Life and Religious Labors of.* Philadelphia, 1828; 5th ed., New York, Isaac T. Hopper, 1832.

Hicks, Elias, *A series of Extemporaneous Discourses delivered in Philadelphia, etc.* Philadelphia, J. & E. Parker, 1825. [These are referred to as "Philadelphia Sermons.]

Hicks, Elias and **Edward,** *Sermons delivered by, in Friends' Meetings, New York, in 5th Month, 1825, taken in shorthand by L. H. Clarke and T. C. Gould, stenographers.* New York, sold by J. V. Shearman, 1825.

Hicks, Rachel, *Life, Written by Herself.* New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1890.

Hodgson, William, *The Society of Friends in the Nine-*

teenth Century: A Historical View of the Successive Convulsions and Schisms therein during the Period. Two vols. Philadelphia, for sale by Smith, English & Co., 1876.

Howgil, Francis, *Dawnings of the Gospel Day, etc.* London (no publisher), 1672.

Hutchinson, Mr. [**Thomas**], *History of Massachusetts Bay, etc.* Vols. 1 and 2. Boston, New England, 1764–67; 2d ed., London, M. Richardson, 1765–68.

Janney, Samuel M., *History of the Religious Society of Friends, from the rise to the year* 1828. Four vols. Philadelphia, T. Ellwood Zell, 1859–67; 2d ed., 1867.

Janney, Samuel M., *The Life of William Penn, with Selections from his Correspondence and Autobiography.* Philadelphia, Lippincott, Grambo & Co., 1st ed., 1851; 2d ed., rev., 1852.

Johns Hopkins University Studies in History and Political Science. Tenth Series "Church and State," Baltimore, 1892.

Long Island Historical Society, Memoirs of the. Vol. i., "Journal of a Voyage to New York in 1679–80." [Jasper Dankers and Peter Sluyter.] Brooklyn, published by the Society, 1867.

Magill, Edward H., *Education in the Religious Society of Friends.* Philadelphia, Friends' Book Association, 1893.

Marsden, J. B., *History of the Early Puritans* [to 1642]. London, Hamilton, Adams & Co., 1850; 2d ed., 1853.

Marsden, J. B., *History of the Later Puritans* [to 1662]. London, Hamilton, Adams & Co., 1852; 2d ed., 1854.

Marshall, Charles, *Journal, Epistles, etc.* London, Richard Barrett, 1844.

Maule, Joshua, *Transactions and Changes in the Society of Friends.* Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1886.

Michener, Ezra A., *Retrospect of Early Quakerism.* Philadelphia, T. Ellwood Zell, 1860.

Mott, James and **Lucretia,** *Life and Letters of.* Edited by their grand-daughter, Anna Davis Hallowell. Boston, Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1884.

Neal, Daniel, *History of New England.* Two vols. London, J. Clark, 1720.

Neill, Edward D., *The English Colonization of America during the Seventeenth Century.* London, Strahan, 1871.

Neill, Edward D., *The Founders of Maryland.* Albany, Joel Munsell, 1876.

Neill, Edward D., *Virginia Carolorum.* Albany, N. Y., Joel Munsell's Sons, 1886.

O'Callaghan, E. B., *Documentary History of New York.* Four vols. Albany, Weed, Parsons & Co., 1850.

Penn, William, *A Collection of the Works of.* Two vols. London, Assigns of J. Sowle, 1726.

Penn, William, Preface to George Fox's "Journal," afterward reprinted in many editions as *Rise and Progress of the People called Quakers.* See list of Doctrinal Works.

Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography. Vols. i.–xvii. Philadelphia, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1877–94.

Proud, Robert, *History of Pennsylvania in North America from 1681 till after the year 1742, etc.* Two vols. Philadelphia, Zachariah Poulson, 1797.

Rowntree, John Stephenson, *Quakerism Past and Present.* London, Smith, Elder & Co., 1859.

Rowntree, John Stephenson, *The Society of Friends, its Faith and Practice.* London, Headley Brothers, 1901.

Rutty, John, *A Treatise Concerning Christian Discipline, etc.* [Dublin ?], printed in the year 1752.

Seebohm, Benjamin, *Memoirs of William Forster.* Two vols. London, Alfred W. Bennett, 1865.

Seebohm, Benjamin, *Memoirs of the Life and Gospel Labors of Stephen Grellet.* Two vols. London, Alfred W. Bennett, 1860; 3d ed., 1862. [Philadelphia, H. Longstreth, 1868.)

Sewel, William, *The History of the Rise, Increase, and Progress of the Christian People called Quakers.* Intermixed with several remarkable occurrences written originally in Low Dutch, and also translated into English [by the author]. The second edition corrected. London, Assigns of J. Sowle, 1725. (Reprinted in many editions.)

Smith, Samuel, *The History of the Colony of Nova Cæsa-*

ria, or New Jersey, etc. Burlington, James Parker, 1765. Reprinted (2d ed.), 1877.

Some account of the Conduct of the Religious Society of Friends towards the Indian Tribes, etc., from the time of their first settlement in America to the year 1843. London, 1844.

Speakman, Thomas, *Divisions in the Society of Friends.* Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1869; 2d ed., enlarged, 1893.

Story, Thomas, *Journal of the Life of.* Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Isaac Thompson & Co., 1747.

Taylor, John, *Memoir of.* London, J. Sowle, 1710; reprinted, York, W. Alexander & Son, 1830.

Thomas, Allen C., *Attitude of the Society of Friends towards Slavery in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, particularly in relation to its own members.* Papers of the American Society of Church History, vol. viii., New York, 1897.

Turner, Frederick Storrs, *The Quakers.* London, Swan, Sonnenschein & Co., 1889.

Webb, Maria, *The Fells of Swarthmoor Hall.* London, T. Bowyer Kitto, 1865; 2d ed., 1867.

Webb, Maria, *Penns and Peningtons of the Seventeenth Century.* London, F. Bowyer Kitto, 1867.

Westcott, Brooke Foss, *Social Aspects of Christianity.* London and Cambridge, Macmillan & Co., 1887.

Whitehead, William A., *East Jersey under the Proprietary Governments,* 1846; 2d ed., revised and enlarged, Newark, N. J., Martin R. Dennis, 1875.

Whittier, John Greenleaf, *The Journal of John Woolman,* with an Introduction. Boston, Jas. R. Osgood & Co., 1876.

Wilbur, John, *Journal of, etc.* Providence, Geo. H. Whitney, 1859.

Wilson, Thomas, *Journal of the Life, Travels, etc., of.* Dublin, Samuel Fuller, 1728.

Winsor, Justin, *Narrative and Critical History of America.* Eight vols. Boston, Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1886–89.

Woolman, John, *Journal of.* Dublin, R. Jackson, 1776. (See also Whittier, John G.)

IV. Doctrinal, Controversial, Etc.

An Address from Rhode Island Quarterly Meeting of Friends to the members of that Religious Society within the limits of New England Yearly Meeting and elsewhere. New York, Percy & Reed, 1845. ["Wilburite."]

An Appeal for the Ancient Doctrines of the Religious Society of Friends. Published by the direction of the Yearly Meeting held in Philadelphia, in the Fourth Month, 1847. Addressed to its members. Philadelphia, printed by Joseph Kite & Co., 1847.

An Appeal to the Society of Friends on the Primitive Simplicity of their Christian Principles, and Church Discipline, and on some recent Proceedings in the said Society. [In regard to Hannah Barnard.] Part I. and II., pp. 233. London, 1801. Also the Sequel,

A Narrative of the Proceedings in America of the Society called Quakers in the case of Hannah Barnard, etc., pp. 145. London, 1804.

Barclay, Robert, *An Apology for the True Christian Divinity as the same is held forth and preached by the People called in Scorn Quakers, etc.* In Latin, Amsterdam, Jacob Claus, 1676; 1st ed. in English [no place], 1678.

Bates, Elisha, *The Doctrines of Friends, etc.* Mount Pleasant, Ohio, 1825. [Frequently republished.]

Christian Discipline of the Society of Friends in Great Britain, etc. London, Samuel Harris & Co., 1883, 14 Bishopsgate Street Without).

A Confession of Faith in the most necessary things of Christian Doctrine, Faith, and Practice according to the Testimony of Holy Scriptures. Given forth from the Yearly Meeting at Burlington the 7th of 7th Moneth, 1692, by the despised Christian People called Quakers. Printed and sold by William Bradford in Philadelphia, 1693. (2d ed.) [Issued by Keith's followers.]

Crewdson, Isaac, *A Beacon to the Society of Friends.* London, Hamilton, Adams & Co., 1835, also New York, 1835.

A Declaration of New England Yearly Meeting o

Friends upon various Christian Doctrines, etc. Providence, Knowles & Vose, 1845.

Declaration of the Yearly Meeting of Friends held in Philadelphia, respecting the proceedings of those who have lately separated from the Society; and also, showing the Contrast between their doctrines and those held by Friends. Philadelphia, 1828.

Epistles from the Yearly Meeting of Friends held in London, to the Quarterly and Monthly Meetings in Great Britain, Ireland, and elsewhere, from 1681 to 1857 inclusive. With an Historical Introduction, and a chapter comprising some of the early Epistles and Records of the Yearly Meeting. In two volumes. London, Edward Marsh, 1858, 14 Bishopsgate Street Without).

An Epistolary Declaration and Testimony of the Yearly Meeting of Friends for New England respecting the Proceedings of those who have effected a Separation therein, etc. Providence, B. A. Moore, 1845.

Evans, Thomas, *Exposition of the Faith of the Society of Friends.* Philadelphia, Kimber & Sharpless, 1827. (Frequently reprinted, Friends' Book-store, Philadelphia.) See also Friends' Library, Introduction, vol. i., p. i. and pp. 109–141.

Gurney, Joseph John, *Observations on the Distinguishing Views and Practices of the Society of Friends.* London, Gilpin, 1824; 7th ed., Darton & Harvey, 1834, New York, various editions.

[Keith, George,] *Some Reasons and Causes of the Late Seperation That hath come to pass at Philadelphia betwix us, called by Some the Seperate Meeting, And Others that meet apart from us. More particularly opened to Vindicate and clear us and our Testimony in that respect, viz., That the Seperation lyeth at their Door, and They (and, not We) are justly chargeable with it. With an Apology for the present Publication of these Things.* Philadelphia, William Bradford, 1692, p. 36.

Letters and Observations relating to the Controversy respecting the Doctrine of Elias Hicks. Containing a review of his letter to Dr. N. Shoemaker. 3d edition revised. Printed for the Reader, 1824.

Narrative of Facts and Circumstances that have tended to produce a Secession from the Society of Friends in New England Yearly Meeting. Providence, Knowles & Vose, 1845. Also *Strictures on the above by the Meeting of Sufferings of New Englaud Yearly Meeting. 1845.*

Penn, William, *The Rise and Progress of the People called Quakers, in which their Fundamental Principles, Doctrines, Worship, Ministry, and Discipline are plainly stated, etc.* 7th ed., London, 1769. (Originally published as the preface to George Fox's "Journal." Many editions, e.g., Friends' Book-store, Philadelphia, 1865.)

Proceedings, including Declaration of Christian Doctrine, of the General Conference of Friends held in Richmond, Indiana, U. S. A., 1887. Published by direction of the Conference. Richmond, Ind., Nicholson & Bro., 1887.

Proceedings of a Conference of Friends of America held in Indianapolis, Indiana. Published by direction of the Conference. Richmond, Ind., Nicholson & Bro., 1892.

Proceedings of the Conference of Friends of America, held in Indianapolis, Ind., 1897. Published by direction of the Conference, Philadelphia. The American Friend, 1898.

Minutes and Proceedings of the Five-Years Meeting of the American Yearly Meetings held in Indianapolis, Ind., 1902. Also Minutes of the Quinquennial Conference. Final session. Published by direction of the Five-Years Meeting, Philadelphia. The John C. Winston Co., 1903.

Proceedings of the Swarthmore Conferences; First-day School General Conference; Friends' Union for Philanthropic Labor; Friends' Religious Conference; Friends' Educational Conference, held on the grounds of Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa., from Fourth-day Eighth Month 19th to Fourth-day Eighth Month 26th, inclusive, 1896. Philadelphia, 1896. Printed for the Conference.

Proceedings of the Friends' General Conference; First-day School, Philanthropic, Educational, Religious;

held at Richmond, Indiana, 1898. Philadelphia, Printed for the Conference, 1898.

Proceedings of the Friends' General Conference, First-day School, Philanthropic, Educational, Religious, held at Chautauqua, New York, 1900, Philadelphia. Printed for the Conference, 1900.

Proceedings of the Friends' General Conference, First-day School, Philanthropic, Educational, Religious, Young Friends' Associations, held at Asbury Park, New Jersey, 1902. Philadelphia. Printed for the Conference, 1902.

Proceedings of the Friends' General Conference, First-day School, Philanthropic, Educational, Religious, Young Friends' Associations, held at Toronto, Canada, 1904. Philadelphia, Printed for the Conference, 1904.

Rules of the Discipline of the Yearly Meeting of Men and Women Friends, held in Philadelphia. Stereotyped for the Yearly Meeting. Philadelphia, 1883. ["Hicksite."]

A Summary of Some of the Doctrines and Testimonies of the People of God or Friends (called Quakers). Prepared and published by Abraham Lawton, Joseph Bancroft, and Evan T. Flinn. Thos. W. Stuckey, printer [1869].

The Testimony of the Society of Friends on the Continent of America. New York, Printed by R. & G. S. Wood, 1830.

A Vindication of the Disciplinary Proceedings of New England Yearly Meeting of Friends by the Meeting for Sufferings. Boston, 1852.

V. Legal Trials and Decisions.

Bancroft, Sidney C., *Report of some of the Proceedings in the case of Oliver Earle and others, in Equity against William Wood and others in the Supreme Court of Commonwealth of Massachusetts, including the opinion of the Court as pronounced, Lemuel Shaw, C. J., etc.* Boston, Little, Brown & Co., 1855.

Foster, Jeremiah J., *An Authentic Report of the Testimony in a cause at issue in the Court of Chancery of the State of New Jersey, between Thomas L.*

Shotwell, Complainant, and Joseph Hendrickson and Stacy Decow, Defendants. Two vols. Philadelphia, J. Harding, 1831.

A Full Report of the Case of Stacy Decow and Joseph Hendrickson vs. *Thomas L. Shotwell, decided at a Special Term of the New Jersey Court of Appeals, held at Trenton in July and August,* 1833, *embracing the decision of the Court of Chancery from which the Appeal was made, the arguments of the Counsel on each side, and the Final Decision of the Court of Appeals. Taken down in shorthand by competent reporters, and revised by the respective counsel.* Philadelphia, P. J. Gray, 1834.

Report of the Trial of Friends, Steubenville, Ohio, 15–26 October, 1828. Philadelphia, 1829.

VI. Periodicals.

The American Friend, vols. 1–12, Philadelphia, 1894–1905. [This paper is a continuation of the Friends' Review, and Christian Worker.]

The British Friend, First Series, vols. 1–49, Glasgow, 1843–1891 ; New Series, vols. 1–14, Glasgow, and London, 1892–1905.

The Christian Worker, vols. 1–24, New Vienna, Ohio, and Chicago, 1871–1894.

The Friend, (Philadelphia), vols. 1–78, Philadelphia, 1827–1905.

The Friend, (London), First Series, vols. 1–18, 1843–1860 ; New Series, vols. 1–45, London, 1861–1905.

Friends' Intelligencer and Journal, vols. 1–62, Philadelphia, 1847–1905.

Friends' Quarterly Examiner, vols. 1–39, London, 1867–1905.

Friends' Review, vols. 1–48, Philadelphia, 1847–1894.

The Journal of the Friends' Historical Society, vols. 1–2, London, 1903–1905.

Miscellaneous Repository, edited by Elisha Bates, vols. 1–4, Mount Pleasant, Ohio, 1827–1831. [A fifth volume was published, partly in Ohio, and partly in England, the numbers appearing at irregular intervals.]

INDEX.

A.

American Revolution, Friends and the, 116–118.
Anti-slavery Friends, (Indiana), 174.
Archdale, John, 88.

B.

Baltimore Yearly Meeting, 80, 81. Separation in, 140; "Wilburites" in, 152.
Baptism, 56.
Barclay, Robert, 86.
Barclay, Robert (19th cent.), his "Inner Life," etc., 40, (note).
Barclay's Apology, 55.
Barnard, Hannah, 119–120.
"Beaconites," 143.
Bible, estimation of, 57, ignorance of, 121, and (note).
Bible Schools established, 170.
Bible Society, 121 (note), 170.
Bibliography, 229–241.
"Binns Meeting" in Ohio, 152.
Bryn Mawr College, 189.
Buck Hill Falls Summer School, 213.
Burlington, N. J., 84. Yearly Meeting, 85.
Burnyeat, John, 69, 74, 78, 80.

C.

Canada, Yearly Meeting, 195.
"Canons and Institutions," 52, 106.
Carolinas, The, 86–88.
Civil War, Friends and the, 175–178.
Colleges and Schools, 164–166, 186–190.
Confederate Government and Friends, 177.
Conferences ("Hicksite,") 211–214.
Conferences (Orthodox)"1829," 169; "1849," "1851," "1853," 150–151; "1887," 198; "1892," 201; "1897," 215; "1902," 216.
Connecticut, Friends in, 71.
"Constitution and Discipline," 1900, 24–26, 216.
Creeds, not used, 53. See Declarations of Faith.

D.

Declarations of Faith, 53–55; 167; 198.
Decline in members, Causes of, 191–194.
Discipline, 14; Rise of, 103–109;

"Uniform," 24–26, 216; see "Canons and Institutions," also Constitution and Discipline.
Doctrines, distinguishing, 36–39; 54.
Dress, 44.

E.

Edmundson, William, 69, 75, 78, 86.
Education, 50, 186–190.
Educational Conference, 1905, 220; Conferences, 221.
Elders, 18, 108 (note).
Emigration to the West, 191–193.
Fell, Margaret, afterward Margaret Fox, 39.

F.

Five-Years Meeting, 25, of "1902," 217–220.
Fox, George, sketch of, 28–30; his practice and teaching, 30–35; "illiteracy," 35 (note); and schools, 50; in New England, 69; in New York, 74; Virginia, 78; Maryland, 80, 81; Carolina, 86.
"Free Quakers," 118.
"Friend, The," 171.
Friends, The, Rise of, 27 ff.; growth, 35; early doctrines, 36; missionary zeal, 36; early ministry in, 39; origin of name, 41, and 42 (note); number 1700, 102; changes in, 195 ff., 200, 203.
"Friends Library," 171.

G.

George School, 165.
German Friends, 1688, protest against slavery, 113.
Grant, President, his "Indian Policy," 179–181.
Grellet, Stephen, 171, 123, (note).
Gurney, Eliza P., and President Lincoln, 176.
Gurney, Joseph John, 144–148.

H.

Haverford College, 188.
Hicks, Elias, 123–127, 128, 130.
"Hicksites," see "Separation, 1828," 160–168; and London Yearly Meeting, 161; numbers, 166, 214; also statistics, 225, 227; Yearly Meetings, 12 (note), 166; conferences, 167, 211–214; doctrine, 167.
"Hoyle Meeting" in Ohio, 152.

I.

Indiana Yearly Meeting, separation, 140; anti-slavery separation, 174.
Indians, American, and Friends, 110–112, 178–183.
"Inner Light," 42.

J.

Janney, Samuel M., 164, 89 (note).

K.

Keith, George, and his schism, 96–98, and note, 96.

"King's Missive," 64.

L.

Language "Plain," 43, 195.
Lincoln, Abraham, 176.
London Yearly Meeting, 51, 52 (note); and "Hicksites," 161, 214 (note); and "Wilburite Separation," 152; and "Conference, 1887," 198; statistics, 226, 227.

M.

Marriage, 58.
Maryland, Friends in, 79–82.
Massachusetts, first Friends in, 62; persecution in, 62 ff.
Meetings, for Discipline, 49; Ministry and Oversight, 21; Monthly, 18, 47, 69; Permanent Board, 17, 25; Preparative, 19, and note; Quarterly, 17, 48; Representative, 17, and note; Select, 22; Sufferings, 17 (note), 102; Yearly Meetings, 12–17; names of Yearly Meetings, 12 (note); new Yearly Meetings, 194, 195; Meetings for Worship, 21, 23, 56.
Membership, 15, 108–110, Associate, 25. "Birthright," 108 ff.
"Middle Ages of Quakerism," 107.
Ministers, 20–21, 56; ministers traveling, 23.
Missions, 35, 36, 204.
Mott, Lucretia, 162, 163.
Moses Brown School, 187.

N.

Negroes, and Friends, 112–115, 172–175, 184; 211 (note); 218.
New Jersey, Friends in, 83–86.
"New Lights," 127.
New York, Friends in, 72–76.
New York Yearly Meeting, 76 and note; separation in, 139; "Wilburites," 150.
New Garden School, 188.
North Carolina Yearly Meeting, 87; in civil war, 178; separation, "Wilburite," 209.
North Carolina Yearly Meeting, ("Wilburite,") 209.

O.

Oaths, 43.
Ohio Yearly Meeting, "separation, 1828," 140; "Wilburite," 149, 152.
Overseers, 19, 108 (note).
Ordinances, 55, 56, 197.

P.

"Pastors" and the "Pastoral System," 25, 200, 202.
Peace Conference, 1901, 207.
Penn, William, and New Jersey, 83; in Pennsylvania, 89–94; and the Indians, 92 ff.
Pennsylvania, Friends in, 88–99, 101.
Permanent Board, 17, 25.
Perrot, John, and his schism, 48, 49 (note), 74, 78, 80.
Philanthropy, 184, 211.
Persecution, see Sufferings.

Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, founded, 85, 95; separation in, 130–139; action in regard to "Wilburites," 154.
"Primitive" Friends, 156, 208.

Q.

Quaker, origin of name, 41 (note).
Queries, 19.

R.

Ranters, 75, and note.
Rhode Island, Friends in, 67–71.

S.

Schools, 164–166; 186–190.
Scriptures, see Bible.
Separations, "1828," 122–142; "Wilbur-Gurney," 143–152; "Anti-slavery," 174; "Wilburite," 149, 155, 156, 209.
Slavery, and Friends, 112–115, 172–175.
Statistics, 225–227.
Steamboat Frank, 183.
"Steeple-houses," 32.
Story, John, 51; see Wilkinson.
Sufferings, 59; in Massachusetts, 61–67; Connecticut, 71; New York, 72 ff.; Virginia, 77; Maryland, 82; civil war, 177, 178; Revolution, 117.
Summer Schools (Orthodox), Haverford, 222; ("Hicksite"), 213.
Supper, the (Eucharist), 56.
Swarthmore College, 166.

T.

Temperance, Cause of, 185, 211, 218, 222.
"Thou and thee," 43.

V.

Virginia, Friends in, 76–79.
Virginia Yearly Meeting, 79 and note, 192.

W.

War, 44, 57, 207. See "Sufferings."
Westtown School, 186.
Whittier, John G., 168 (note), 175.
Wilbur, John, 145–148.
"Wilburites," 143–156, 209–211.
Wilkinson and Story Schism, 50.
Williams, Roger, 69.
Woolman, John, 114, 116 (note).
Woman, position among Friends, 16, 51.
Women's Meetings begun, 51.

Y.

Yearly Meetings set up, 194.
"Young Friends' Associations," 212, 213.

MORDEN